Architecture, Liturgy and Identity

Studies in Gothic Art

Architecture, Liturgy and Identity

Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley

Edited by:

Zoë Opačić

and

Achim Timmermann

BREPOLS

Dr Zoë Opačić received her doctorate at the Courtauld Institute of Art in 2003, under the supervision of Professor Paul Crossley. She is Lecturer in the History and Theory of Architecture at Birkbeck College, University of London, and specialises in the field of late medieval architecture and art, particularly in Central Europe.

Dr Achim Timmermann received his doctorate at the Courtauld Institute of Art in 1996, under the supervision of Professor Paul Crossley. He is Associate Professor of Art History at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. His research interests cover late medieval art and architecture, with particular focus on microarchitecture and the visual stage-management of the body of Christ.

D/2011/0095/12
ISBN 978-2-503-53167-0 (printed version)
ISBN 978-2-503-53968-3 (online version)

Printed in the E.U. on acid-free paper

List of contributors

Klára Benešovská (Ústav dějin umění, Akademie věd České republiky, Prague)
Paul Binski (Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge)
Robert Bork (University of Iowa)
Christoph Brachmann (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
Thomas Coomans (Vrije Universiteit, Brussels)
Michael T. Davis (Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley)
Peter Draper (Birkbeck College, University of London)
Jaś Elsner (Corpus Christi College, Oxford)
Peter Fergusson (Wellesley College)
Eric Fernie (Courtauld Institute of Art, London)
Christian Freigang (Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main)
Alexandra Gajewski (Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, Madrid)
Yves Gallet (Université de Bretagne Occidentale)
John Goodall (Country Life, London)
T.A. Heslop (University of East Anglia, Norwich)
Virginia Jansen (University of California, Santa Cruz)
Tim Juckes (Universität Wien)
Peter Kurmann (Université de Fribourg Suisse)
Linda Monckton (English Heritage, London)
Stephen Murray (Columbia University, New York)
Norbert Nussbaum (Universität zu Köln)
Zoë Opačić (Birkbeck College, University of London)
Wolfgang Schenkluhn (Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg)
Marc Carel Schurr (Université Pierre-Mendès-France Grenoble 2)
Tomasz Torbus (Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas, Leipzig)
Tomasz Węclawowicz (Papieska Akademia Teologiczna, Krakow)
Christopher Wilson (University College London)

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements

We warmly dedicate this two-volume *Liber amicorum* to Professor Paul Crossley, our teacher, mentor and friend for the past two decades, on the occasion of his 65th birthday and his retirement from the Courtauld Institute of Art. Work on this project first began in the autumn of 2005, when, surrounded by a colourful Midwestern Indian Summer, we started to draw up a list of potential contributors. As the list grew longer and longer we soon realized that this was going to be a very substantial tribute, with over fifty authors from the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and the United States. The international spectrum and sheer number of contributors - which is by no means exhaustive - testify to the great esteem in which Paul's scholarship, teaching and unique personality are held across the world. In the end, the *Liber amicorum* became not one but two volumes, the first dedicated to Romanesque and Gothic architecture, the second largely to medieval painting and sculpture, thus fittingly mirroring the impressive breadth and depth of Paul's intellectual interests. Both volumes inaugurate a new series at Brepols Publishers, entitled *Studies in Gothic Art* (*SGA*).

We are particularly grateful to Johan Van der Beke and the staff from Brepols for recognizing the academic value of this *Liber amicorum* and for producing it in the present attractive format. Johan took on and patiently guided the project through its stages and was the first to see its potential as a foundation of a new prestigious series dedicated to the study of Gothic in all its forms. We would equally like to record our profound gratitude to Dr Alexandra Gajewski for her substantial input into volume 1, which ranged from the translation of two articles to valuable editorial assistance; to Andreas Puth for his contributions to volume 2 and Paul's lengthy bibliography; and to Dr Joany Crossley for all her help behind the scenes, which ensured that Paul was kept in blissful ignorance almost to the end. For their unfailing encouragement and support we are much indebted to our spouses, Christopher Masters and Dr Natasha Eaton. Finally, we would like to thank all the authors of these two volumes for their great enthusiasm to be a part of Paul's *Liber amicorum* and for their expediency in working with us, the editors.

Zoë Opačić and Achim Timmermann
London and Ann Arbor, March 20th, 2011

Introduction

This volume follows the trajectory of Gothic from its "golden" age to its metaphorical death, but at its heart is a celebration of one of Gothic architecture's most vibrant and intellectually stimulating scholars of our age. For four decades, first at the University of Manchester and then at the Courtauld Institute of Art, Paul Crossley has illuminated the field of medieval architecture and art as a teacher, lecturer and writer. His extraordinary range of interests, which span the vast tracts of medieval Europe from Poland to the West Country, and his panoptic view of the discipline of art history combined with his memorable verbal dexterity, place him in a category all of his own.

Paul Crossley's legacy to architectural history is profound and manifold, as his long list of publications testifies. His pioneering work on central European architecture, based on first-hand experiences – long before travel to eastern Europe became a weekend pursuit - and on his proficiency in the Polish and Czech languages, brought that, from the point of view of English-speaking scholarship, *terra incognita* into the art-historical mainstream. His seminal publications on the architecture of Kazimir the Great in Poland and Charles IV in Prague have single-handedly transformed the teaching of medieval architecture in English universities from a predominantly Anglo-French into a pan-European experience.

The second strand of Paul's academic interest, born out of his essentially philosophical mindset, is his continuous critical engagement with the ever-changing discipline of art history. His standard works on the historiography of architectural history have defined the subject and furnished it with historical and theoretical terms of reference. A corollary of this deeply set interest in the art historical present as well as the past, are Paul's many book and exhibition reviews. His vividly written, sympathetic yet honest reviews provide a master class in the genre.

On a very general level Paul Crossley's approach is characterised by a profound understanding of buildings, the ideas that shaped them, and the broader world around them. But it is Paul as the *Meister der Synthese* (to paraphrase Ferdinand Seibt's description of Charles IV) that stands out, especially his rare ability to transform abstract philosophical and architectural concepts into sophisticated but intelligible narratives. His gift to tell a compelling story, to give history a plot while never losing sight of the essence of the problem at hand, powered by his luminous rhetoric, have justly earned him the reputation of being one of art history's most inspiring teachers and lecturers. These timeless qualities have also ensured that Paul Crossley's work will never become dated, a fact that is also testified to by the frequent references to his publications and ideas in this two-volume Festschrift.

Alongside publications, distinguished academic careers are usually measured by the yardstick of honorary fellowships and memberships. In this instance the list speaks volumes not only of the high esteem in which Paul is universally held by his peers but also of his indefatigable energy and commitment to his discipline. As well as being a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, he is a Fellow of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, a rare honour for a non-Pole and recognition of his profound contribution to the Polish as well as English scholarly community. In 2000 he was visiting professor at the Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas at Leipzig University. From 2000 he served as an editor of the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* for eleven years. He was made Professor in 2002. Paul is still a member of the editorial board of *Umění* (published by the Institute of History of Art at the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague) and of the Consultative Committee of *The Burlington Magazine*, to which he is a regular contributor. He is also on the advisory boards of the Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi Great Britain and of Brepols's architectural series *Architectura Medii Aevi*. And, just to demonstrate that he has no intention of taking an easy road into retirement, he has accepted to serve as a member of the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England. In 2012 he will deliver the prestigious Slade Lectures in Fine Art at Cambridge, an eagerly anticipated occasion.

Impressive though they undoubtedly are, the publications and accolades fail to describe Paul Crossley's unique personality. Few people who have met Paul have been left unaffected by his extraordinary and humane charisma. Many - his students and colleagues alike - will always remember his selfless kindness, infectious optimism and the inexhaustible humour of a true scholar who was never destined for an ivory tower. It is, therefore, fitting that Paul's illustrious career should be described from a personal perspective by three colleagues who worked with him and who offer their reminiscences in his honour.

Paul Crossley as a Student

I have known Paul for not far short of fifty years. He has become a close personal friend, and I make no pretence of being able to regard him with a cold dispassionate eye. This has nothing to do with claiming him as my acolyte, for in an academic sense he was already going his own very different way when he was still an undergraduate, which was as it should be in those more enlightened days when universities were where you went to educate yourself after school. He went up to Cambridge in 1963, as a Senior Scholar at Trinity College, to read law, which I think he did for two years, before switching to art history. During that time he became president of the Union, a conjunction that would once have been his entrée to a lucrative career at the bar, or a distinguished one in politics. I am sure he would have been good at it too, either way, for right from the start he had the gift of words, and the lethal fluency of his Ciceronian rhetoric, though much appreciated, was almost wasted in the rebarbative, jargon-ridden world of art-historical discourse.

The shift from law to art reveals a lot about Paul. It was a step away from the harsh realities of everyday existence, with its dubious compensation of wealth and status, into the contemplative life of the mind, which was its own reward. In a different age it might have been from law to religion. I suspect that in its subtle Catholic way Downside did leave its subliminal but indelible mark upon him, a perception that is not intended to imply that I see him as a character out of Graham Greene, just that he has always had a penchant for religious art, and medieval religious art in particular, where his empathy with what it meant has been a life-long preoccupation.

His year was an *annus mirabilis* for the fledgling art-historical tripos at Cambridge. He got a first in 1967 and went on to a higher degree. This was where I really got to know him, for though he was a Cambridge student, I was co-opted to act as his supervisor, and this had the effect of attaching him to the Courtauld for the duration of his post-graduate work. If the retreat from law to art history was otherworldly, his choice of topic for research was almost a leap into outer darkness. He decided to reopen the Pevsner thesis about English influence on the fourteenth-century Gothic churches of the Baltic coastal towns and their hinterland. This put him beyond the pale for little Englanders, who were totally uninterested in far away places like eastern Europe, and there was a very real danger that he was making himself unemployable in an English university. But Paul stuck to his guns when this was pointed out to him. He learnt German, and even Polish. At the Courtauld he met George Zarnecki, who in true cloak-and-dagger mode arranged for him to meet up with his old friend Lech Kalinowski at Krakow, and by this privileged route all doors were opened to him in Poland. The thesis became a viable proposition, which at the height of the Cold War was no mean achievement. There was also a spin-off. Zarnecki and Kalinowski, who were echt-Polish and notable exponents of the *style gallant* for which their countrymen are famous, knew a kindred spirit when they met one, and in a manner of speaking, Paul acquired an alter ego as an honorary Pole. He returned from his research safari into Poland with the material for a thesis that in the event has made him our man on the medieval art of Mitteleuropa, and a debonair charisma that has been the secret of his successful career as a teacher and cultural ambassador.

My own part in his progress was minimal. Supervisions were brief, for the very good reason that he was instructing me rather than the other way round, and they usually ended in the pub around the corner from the Courtauld with long sessions of conversation about everything under the sun apart from art history: they were the real stuff of academic life and I think they meant as much to him as to me. They are still on-going. The one thing that I did manage to do for him was to persuade my volatile friend Reginald Dodwell, who was professor of art history at Manchester, to give Paul his first chance as an untried lecturer. Reg had been let down rather badly by a Courtauld man who had been wished enthusiastically upon him from on high by the great and the good. He had known Paul at Trinity when he was in charge of the famous library there, which may have helped; but he had to take my word for it that Paul was up to the mark, and he did not let me down. Some time later Reg thanked me profusely, and ever afterwards treated me as though I was the Delphic Oracle.

Peter Kidson
Courtauld Institute of Art, London

Paul Crossley in Manchester: An Appreciation

Paul Crossley's reputation had already preceded him when we both arrived at the Department of Art History in Manchester University in September 1971. "Where is Paul Crossley?" was the first question I was asked when I arrived, and it was to be constantly and eagerly repeated in the seventeen years during which I was his colleague at Manchester. It was known that he had been President of the Union at Cambridge University. Even so his sparkle, which seemed to lighten up any gathering in which he was present, came each time as a newly experienced tonic. Those who did not see him every day and at close quarters may not have realized how hard he always worked. We were both writing lecture courses for the first time, but during the short period when we shared a house he was up long after I had retired exhausted to bed. He was covering page after page with notes written in his small, elegant handwriting. He was laying the foundation of what became his monumental re-edition of Paul Frankl's Pelican History of Art volume on *Gothic Architecture*.

From the beginning Paul was an inspiring teacher. It was not only his rhetorical gifts, though they were, of course, exceptional, that held his students. It was the extent of his art-historical knowledge, his wide reading and his culture more generally that awed them. At the same time, as if his new job was not taxing enough, he began giving Adult Education Courses, and put immense effort into these too, impelled by an almost Ruskinian sense of obligation. His devoted following persuaded him to organize study trips, first to local medieval buildings, then more ambitiously to France. A few of his friends and colleagues were permitted to come on these. We would gather very early on the Barlow Moor Road on a bleak, cheerless Friday morning (Manchester generally lived up to its reputation, so it was sure to be raining). There we would wait for the bus, which would speed south on the motorway, sometimes taking in Rochester or Canterbury Cathedral, on the way to Dover. Then after the sea crossing came the first night at some spartan hotel in Calais, and two very full days followed, seeing whatever selection of four, five or even six cathedrals had been planned. Amongst those visited on different trips were Amiens, Laon, Senlis, Paris, Sens, Chartres, Beauvais, Rouen and even distant Reims. Oblivious of hunger or fatigue Paul would hold forth without notes on mouldings and buttresses and tracery, and of course the mysterious *Root 2*. There would be references to a legendary mentor named "P.K.", contributing extra weight to his discourse. Paul, sometimes with me accompanying him, took his Manchester students on short and equally thrilling tours to the Welsh Castles or to the West Country for example. The Department also ran study trips of two to three weeks to Europe, which by some clever stratagem had been made obligatory so that local councils were obliged to fund them. But these only came up every few years, and our similar periods of interest meant that we never took a trip

together. Paul might have become the "Telly Art Historian" of his generation, but the opportunity was missed or maybe he turned it down. It is certain that no-one who went on any of those trips with Paul will ever forget them.

Paul was occupied in those same years in finishing his dissertation on the architecture of Kasimir the Great of Poland and Krakow Cathedral, and then in preparing it for publication. Some lucky academics are able to overlap their teaching and their research, but graduate students were rare at Manchester and their instruction was informal. So work on Gothic in eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain was not only challenging in itself, but it formed no part of his regular teaching. I often urged him to write an introduction to the subject for a general audience, since it was, and is still, unfamiliar even to many specialists. Paul's standards were too high, however, for him ever to agree to write a "pot-boiler". It might still be possible, however, for some enterprising academic institution in Europe or America to invite him to give a series of lectures on the subject, which could then be published.

Perhaps Paul has had not only impossibly high standards, but also too many other interests. Music was always an enduring passion, both his own piano playing and the many opportunities for concerts in Manchester. In the early years at Manchester he was still painting the English countryside in watercolours like a reborn Cotman. The "magical sound of bat on ball" was referred to amid peals of laughter, though whether he ever found time to visit Old Trafford for a Test Match I rather doubt. These were perhaps part of his own self-conscious English Neo-Romanticism, a trend which he analyses with his particular blend of insight and gentle humour in the article that he wrote for my Festschrift. This was in turn part of his interest in the historiography of his discipline, as when in that particular article he plays off John Harvey against Nikolaus Pevsner. Paul's gift as a mimic was a different method of largely affectionate criticism. The victim was never allowed to be present, but the process had something of the Medieval "Feast of Fools" when licence was granted to mock equally the pompous and the revered.

Retirement has little meaning for a true scholar. Whatever Paul goes on to do with his increased leisure now, a deeper study of Schopenhauer, a magisterial book on the Gothic cathedral (in conjunction with his Slade Lectures), annual visits to Bayreuth, he will continue to contribute his gift of infectious enthusiasm and Wordsworthian joy to all who surround him.

Jonathan J. G. Alexander
Institute of Fine Arts, New York University

Paul Crossley at the Courtauld Institute

Paul was appointed to teach medieval architecture at the Courtauld Institute in March 1990 and took up his post in September of that year. The Institute had moved from its home in Portman Square to the larger quarters at Somerset House in the previous year, coincidentally just at the time when government pressure was leading to a sharp increase in student numbers. Peter Kidson was retiring and, in spite of the usual financial crisis, it was clearly essential to preserve a teaching post in medieval architecture, not least, it was argued, because architectural historians can obtain employment in the heritage industry.

For those on the appointment board who had hardly known Paul beforehand, his arrival and early terms were a revelation. His sheer enthusiasm for his subject, as much as for life in general, was contagious. John Newman described a joint visit to Ely by all of one year's architectural students and their awed silence as they listened to Paul's brilliant, ad-libbed description of the cathedral's architecture and decoration. The Institute had clearly acquired a star performer. Equally, he was happy to undertake administrative tasks when required, and his ability in this regard was demonstrated when

he later carried out his stint as head of the medieval section. Indeed, he served for eleven years as an editor of the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, in which capacity his contribution was generally considered to have been outstanding.

His popularity with both colleagues and students was marked by a more personal characteristic. Wherever it was that he saw you and however well or little he knew you, he managed to convey the feeling that you were the one person he was most delighted to meet. This could of course be just a superficial manner, but in Paul's case, on the contrary, it was symptomatic of a deeply felt kindness and concern for others. Most would agree that he was the nicest person at the Institute.

Such a judgement was confirmed by seeing him at home with Joany and their two, then small, children, Nicholas and Katie, now both successful students. The atmosphere was always congenial and it was a pleasure to be in their company. Paul's qualities as a teacher may be judged both by the ease with which he could fill a lecture hall and by the sheer number of students, from undergraduates to PhDs, who have been attracted to the study of medieval architecture in his time at the Institute. With his encouragement many have continued on to have successful careers in the field. And, if further proof were needed, here is his Festschrift, exceptionally in two volumes, with over fifty contributions, including his own former students, who are part of his enduring legacy.

Michael Kauffmann
Courtauld Institute of Art, London

Paul Crossley

The Publications of Paul Crossley

Monographs and exhibition catalogues

- *Gothic Architecture in the Reign of Kasimir the Great: Church Architecture in Lesser Poland, 1320-1380* (Biblioteka wawelska, 7), Krakow, 1985.
- *Medieval and Early Renaissance Treasures in the North West,* (exhibition catalogue, Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester, 15.1.-28.2.1976), Richmond, 1976 (with Jonathan Alexander).
- *Medieval Architecture and Sculpture in the North West,* Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester, 1976 (with David Griffiths & Peter Milburn).

Edited and co-edited volumes

- *Architecture and Language: Constructing Identity in European Architecture, c. 1000 – c. 1650,* Cambridge, UK, 2000 (with Georgia Clarke).
- Paul Frankl, *Gothic Architecture,* revised edition (Yale University Press Pelican History of Art), New Haven, 2000.
- *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson,* London, 1990 (with Eric Fernie).

Articles in journals

- "The Reshaping of French Gothic", in *The Burlington Magazine,* 152, 2010, p. 177-179.
- "England trifft auf Deutschland: Der Fall Nikolaus Pevsner", in *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft,* 62, 2008, p. 247-256.
- "Peter Parler and England: A Problem Re-Visited", in *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch,* 64, 2003, p. 53-82.
- "'Bohemia Sacra' and 'Polonia Sacra': Liturgy and History in Prague and Cracow Cathedrals", *Folia historiae artium,* new series, 2001, 7, p. 49-69.
- "Powrót do lasu : architektura naturalna i niemiecka przeszlosc w czasach Dürera", *Dziela i interpretacje,* 2, 1994, p. 119-126.
- "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: The Limits of Iconography", *The Burlington Magazine,* 130, 1988, p. 116-121.
- "Katedra krakowska na tle czternastowiecznego gotyku w Europie Srodkowej", *Sprawozdania o/ PAN w Krakowie,* XVIII/1, 1975, p. 139-141
- "Neo-medieval magic. A look at All Saints, Jesus Lane", *Trinity Review,* 1968, p. 6-8.

Articles in books and exhibition catalogues

- "Bristol Cathedral and Nikolaus Pevsner: Sondergotik in the West Country", in *The Medieval Art and Architecture of Bristol Cathedral,* ed. Jon Cannon & Beth Williamson (Bristol Studies in Medieval Cultures), Woodbridge, 2011 (forthcoming).
- *"Ductus and memoria: Chartres Cathedral and the Workings of Rhetoric", in Rhetoric beyond Words: Delight and Persuasion in the Arts of the Middle Ages,* ed. Mary Carruthers (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 78), Cambridge, 2010, p. 214-249.

- "Introduction/Einführung" to the chapter Prague "Hauptstadt des Weltreiches" (with Michael Menzel), in *Kunst als Herrshaftsinstrument: Böhmen und das Heilige Römische Reich unter den Luxemburgern im europäischen Kontext,* ed. Jiří Fajt & Andrea Langer, Berlin & Munich, 2009, p. 4-5.
- "The Integrated Cathedral: Thoughts on 'Holism' and Gothic Architecture", in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness,* ed. Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan & Ellen M. Shortell, Farnham, 2009, p. 157-173.
- "Our Lady of Nuremberg, All Saints Chapel in Prague, and the High Choir of Prague Cathedral", in *Prague and Bohemia: Medieval Art, Architecture and Cultural Exchange in Central Europe,* ed. Zoë Opačić (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 32), Leeds, 2009, p. 64-80.
- "Between Spectacle and History: Art History and the Medieval Exhibition", in *Late Gothic England: Art and Display,* ed. Richard Marks, Donnington & London, 2007, p. 138-153.
- "Introduction", in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture,* ed. Alexandra Gajewski & Zoë Opačić (Architectura Medii Aevi, 1), Turnhout, 2007, p. 9-16.
- "The Wernerkapelle in Bacharach", in *Mainz and the Middle Rhine Valley. Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology,* ed. Ute Engel & Alexandra Gajewski (The British Archaeological Association Transactions, 30), Leeds, 2007, p. 167-192.
- "Salem and the Ogee Arch", in *Architektur und Monumentalskulptur des 12. – 14. Jahrhunderts: Produktion und Rezeption; Festschrift für Peter Kurmann zum 65. Geburtstag = Architecture et sculpture monumentale du 12e au 14e siècle: production et réception; mélanges offerts à Peter Kurmann à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire,* ed. Stephan Gasser, Christian Freigang & Bruno Boerner, Bern, 2006, p. 321-342.
- "'Ara patriae': Saint Stanislaus, the Jagiellonians and the Coronation Ordinal for Cracow Cathedral", in *Künstlerische Wechselwirkungen in Mitteleuropa,* ed. Jiří Fajt (Studia Jagiellonica Lipsiensia, 1), Ostfildern, 2006, p. 103-121.
- "Die Krone des böhmischen Königtums", in *Karl IV., Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden: Kunst und Repräsentation des Hauses Luxemburg 1310-1437,* (exhibition catalogue, Pražský hrad, Prague), ed. Jiří Fajt, Munich, 2006, p. 196-217 (with Zoë Opačić). Published also in the Czech version as: "Koruna Českého království", in *Karel IV. Císař z boží milosti. Kultura a umění za vlády Lucemburků 1310-1437,* (exhibition catalogue, Pražský hrad, Prague), ed. Jiří Fajt, Prague, 2006, p. 196-217.
- "Anglia perdita: English Medieval Architecture and Neo-Romanticism", in *Tributes to Jonathan J. G. Alexander: The Making and Meaning of Illuminated Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, Art & Architecture,* ed. Susan L'Engle & Gerald B. Guest, London, 2006, p. 471-485.
- "Prague as a New Capital", in *Prague: The Crown of Bohemia, 1347-1437,* (exhibition catalogue, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), ed. Barbara Drake Boehm & Jiří Fajt, New York, 2005, p. 58-73 (with Zoë Opačić).
- "'Der Soldat der Wissenschaft': Paul Frankl und die gotische Kathedrale", in *100 Jahre Kunstgeschichte an der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg: Personen und Werke,* ed. Wolfgang Schenkluhn (Hallesche Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte, 5/6), Halle: 2004, p. 71-82.
- "Peter Parler and England: A Problem Re-Visited", in *Parlerbauten: Architektur, Skulptur, Restaurierung,* ed. Richard Strobel (Arbeitsheft, Landesdenkmalamt Baden-Württemberg, 13.2004), Stuttgart, 2004, p. 155-179.
- "Introduction", in *Reassessing Nikolaus Pevsner*, ed. Peter Draper, Aldershot, 2004, p. 1-25.
- "'The Soldier of Science': Paul Frankl and the Gothic Cathedral", in *Magistro et Amico amici discipulique: Lechowi Kalinowskiemu w osiemdziesiolecie urodzin,* ed. Jerzy Gadomski, Krakow, 2002, p. 23-34.

- "The Nave of Stone Church in Kent", in *Essays in Architectural History Presented to John Newman* (Architectural History, 44, 2001), London, 2001, p. 195-211.
- "England and the Baltic: New Thoughts on Old Problems", *in England and the Continent in the Middle Ages: Studies in Memory of Andrew Martindale; Proceedings of the 1996 Harlaxton Symposium* (Harlaxton Medieval Studies, 8), ed. John Mitchell & Matthew Moran, Stamford, 2000, p. 113-128 (with Steffani Becker-Hounslow).
- "'Monuments to the Mighty Will of Their Builders': A Note on Prussian 'Backsteingotik' and the Problem of 'German' Vaults in the Territory of the Teutonic Knights", in *Borders in Art: Revisiting 'Kunstgeographie'*, ed. Katarzyna Murawska-Muthesius, Warsaw, 2000, p. 161-173.
- "The Politics of Presentation: The Architecture of Charles IV of Bohemia", in *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe,* ed. Sarah Rees Jones, Richard Marks & Alastair J. Minnis, York, 2000, p. 99-172.
- "Architecture", in *The New Cambridge Medieval History,* vol. 6, c. 1300 - c. 1415, ed. Michael Jones, Cambridge, 2000, p. 234-256.
- "Bohemia sacra: Liturgy and History in Prague Cathedral", in *Pierre, lumière, couleur: Études d'histoire de l'art du moyen âge en l'honneur d'Anne Prache,* ed. Fabienne Joubert & Danny Sandron (Cultures et civilisations médiévales, 20), Paris, 1999, p. 341-365.
- "The Man from Inner Space: Architecture and Meditation in the Choir of St. Laurence in Nuremberg", in *Medieval Art: Recent Perspectives,* ed. Gale R. Owen-Crocker & Timothy Graham, Manchester, 1998, p. 165-182.
- "Architecture and painting", in *The New Cambridge Medieval History,* vol. 7, c. 1415 - c. 1500, ed. Christopher Allmand, Cambridge, 1998, p. 299-318.
- "The Architecture of Queenship: Royal Saints, Female Dynasties and the Spread of Gothic Architecture in Central Europe", in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne Duggan, Woodbridge, 1997, p. 263-300.
- "Kraków Cathedral and the Formation of a Dynastic Architecture in Southern Central Europe", in *Polish and English Responses to French Art and Architecture: Contrasts and Similarities; Papers Delivered at the University of London* / University of Warsaw History of Art, ed. Frances Ames-Lewis, London, 1995, p. 31-46.
- "The Return to the Forest: Natural Architecture and the German Past in the Age of Dürer", in *Künstlerischer Austausch: Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin, 15. - 20. Juli 1992*, ed. Thomas W. Gaethgens, Berlin, 1993, p. 71-80.
- "Lincoln and the Baltic: The Fortunes of a Theory", in *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson*, ed. Paul Crossley & Eric Fernie, London, 1990, p. 169-180.
- "The Early Middle Ages", in *Art of the Western World*, ed. Denise Hooker, London, 1989, p. 58-93.
- "The Vaults of Kraków Cathedral and the Cistercian Tradition", in *Podlug Nieba i zwyczaju polskiego: Studia z historii architektury sztuki i kultury ofiarowane Adamowi Milobedzkiemu,* ed. Zbigniew Bania, Warsaw, 1988, p. 63-72.
- "Kasimir the Great at Wiślica", in *Romanesque and Gothic: Essays for George Zarnecki*, ed. Neil Stratford, Woodbridge, 1987, p. 39-48.
- "English Gothic Architecture", in *The Age of Chivalry. Art and Architecture in Plantagenet England 1200-1400,* ed. Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski (exhibition catalogue Royal Academy, London), London, 1987, p. 60-73 (also several catalogue numbers in the same volume)
- "In Search of an Iconography of Medieval Architecture", in *Symbolae historiae artium: Studia z historii sztuki Lechowi Kalinowskiemu dedykowane*, Warsaw, 1986, p. 55-66.

- "Wells, the West Country, and Central European Late Gothic", in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Wells and Glastonbury*, ed. Nicola COLDSTREAM & Peter DRAPER (The British Archaeological Association Transactions, 4), Leeds, 1981, p. 81-109.

Reviews, books and exhibitions

- "Roland RECHT, Believing and Seeing: the Art of Gothic Cathedrals, Chicago, 2008", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 151, 2009, p. 771-772.
- "Paul BINSKI, Becket's Crown: Art and Imagination in Gothic England, 1170-1300, New Haven, 2004", in *The Art Bulletin*, 88, 2006, p. 393-396.
- "Sigismundus rex et imperator: Kunst und Kultur zur Zeit Sigismunds von Luxemburg 1387-1437, ed. Imre TAKÁCS (exhibition catalogue Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest & Musée national d'histoire et d'art, Luxembourg, 2006), Mainz, 2006", in *Hungarian Quarterly*, 47, 2006, p. 3-5.
- "Susanne H. KOLTER, Die gestörte Form: Zur Tradition und Bedeutung eines architektonischen Topos, Weimar, 2002", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 146, 2004, p. 559-560.
- "John JAMES, The Creation of Gothic Architecture, an Illustrated Thesaurus: The Ark of God, I: The Evolution of Foliate Capitals, 1170-1250, West Grinstead, 2002", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 146, 2004, p. 266.
- "Julien CHAPUIS, Tilman Riemenschneider: Master Sculptor of the Late Middle Ages, New Haven, 2000", in *Renaissance Studies*, 15, 2001, p. 562-566.
- "Norbert NUSSBAUM, German Gothic Church Architecture, 2nd ed. revised and expanded, New Haven, 2000", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 60, 2001, p. 93-96.
- "Johannes Tripps, Das handelnde Bildwerk in der Gotik: Forschungen zu den Bedeutungsschichten und der Funktion des Kirchengebäudes und seiner Ausstattung in der Hoch- und Spätgotik, Berlin, 2000", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 143, 2001, p. 761-762.
- "Katharina Corsepius, Notre-Dame-en-Vaux: Studien zur Baugeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts in Châlons-sur-Marne (Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und christlichen Archäologie, 18), Stuttgart, 1997", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 141 1999, p. 693.
- "Hans Erich Kubach & Isolde Köhler-Schommer, Romanische Hallenkirchen in Europa, Mainz, 1997", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 141, 1999, p. 172-173.
- "Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken: Europäisches Fürstentum im Mittelalter, exhibition catalogue, ed. Ursula VORWERK, Mainz, 1998", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 141 1999, p. 694.
- "Art au temps des rois maudits: Philippe le Bel et ses fils, ed. Danielle GABORIT-CHOPIN, (exhibition catalogue, Grand Palais, Paris), Paris, 1998", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 140, 1998, p. 409-411.
- "Teresa MROCZKO & Marian ARSZYNSKI, Architektura gotycka w Polsce, Warsaw, 1995", in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, 60, 1998, p. 483-490.
- "Ulrike Seeger, Zisterzienser und Gotikrezeption: Die Bautätigkeit des Babenbergers Leopold VI. in Lilienfeld und Klosterneuburg, Munich, 1997", in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 61, 1998, p. 425-431.
- "Teresa Mroczko & Marian Arszynski, Architektura gotycka w Polsce, Warsaw, 1995", *Kunstchronik*, 50, 1997, 352-368.
- "Kathryn BRUSH, The Shaping of Art History. Wilhelm Vöge, Adolph Goldschmidt and the Study of Medieval Art, Cambridge, 1996", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 139, 1997, p. 559.
- "Jean FAVIÈRE, L'Hôtel de Jacques Cœur à Bourges (Monuments en perspective), Paris, 1992", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 53, 1994, p. 488-489.

- "Lazlo Gerevich, Towns in Medieval Hungary (Social Science Monographs), New York, 1990", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 53, 1994, p. 373.
- "Charles M. Radding & William W. Clark, Medieval Architecture, Medieval Learning: Builders and Masters in the Age of Romanesque and Gothic, New Haven & London, 1992", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 136, 1994, p. 172-173.
- "Jacques Gardelles, Aquitaine Gothique, Paris, 1992", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 135, 1993, p. 493.
- "Madeline Caviness, Sumptious Arts at the Royal Abbeys of Reims and Braine: Ornatus elegantiae, varietate stupendes, Princeton, 1991", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 133, 1991, p. 715.
- "Willibald Sauerländer, Das Jahrhundert der großen Kathedralen, 1140-1260, Munich, 1990", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 133, 1991, p. 316-317.
- "Christopher Wilson, The Gothic Cathedral: The Architecture of the Great Church, 1130-1530, London, 1990", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 133, 1991, p. 547-549.
- "Stephen Murray, Beauvais Cathedral: Architecture of Transcendence, Princeton, 1989", in *Times Literary Supplement*, 4510, 1989, p. 982.
- "Uwe Albrecht, Von der Burg zum Schloß: Französische Schloßbaukunst im Spätmittelalter, Worms, 1986", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 130, 1988, p. 375.
- "Sonia Brough, The Goths and the Concept of Gothic in Germany from 1500 to 1750: Culture, Language and Architecture, Frankfurt, 1985", in *The Modern Language Review*, 83, 1988, p. 511-512 (with Peter Skrine).
- "Peter Fergusson, Architecture of Solitude: Cistercian Abbeys in Twelfth-Century England, Princeton, 1984", in *Kunstchronik*, 39, 1986, 294-307.
- "Hans Josef Böker: Englische Sakralarchitektur des Mittelalters, Darmstadt, 1984", in *Kunstchronik*, 39, 1986, p. 294-307.
- "Wolfgang Schenkluhn, Ordines studentes: Aspekte zur Kirchenarchitektur der Dominikaner und Franziskaner im 13. Jahrhundert, Berlin, 1985", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 128, 1986, p. 220-221.
- "Veit Stoß: Die Vorträge des Nürnberger Symposions, ed. Rainer Kahsnitz, Munich, p. 1985)", *The Burlington Magazine*, 128, 1986, p. 428-429.
- "Ernö Marosi, Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn: Esztergom in der Kunst des 12. - 13. Jahrhunderts, Budapest, 1984", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 126, 1984, p. 787.
- "Walter C. Leedy, Fan Vaulting: A Study of Form, Technology, and Meaning, Santa Monica, 1980", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 40, 1981, p. 155-157.
- "Jean Bony, The English Decorated Style: Gothic Architecture Transformed, 1250-1350, Oxford, 1979", in *The Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 133, 1981, p. 132-137.

Other publications

- "C. R. Dodwell (1922-1994)", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 136, 1994, p. 620 (obituary).
- "Frankl, Paul" & "Gothic Architecture, late 13th century- 16th century" in *Grove's Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner, 34 vols., Basingstoke, 1996, vol. 11, p. 736-737 & vol. 13, p. 53-71.

Compiled by Achim Timmermann, Zoë Opačić, Alexandra Gajewski, and Andreas Puth

A Golden Age of Gothic*

Jaś Elsner

In the introduction to his masterly revision of Paul Frankl's classic *Pelican History of Art* volume, *Gothic Architecture*, Paul Crossley writes:

> "The *Gesamtkunstwerk* of the cathedral has made it particularly susceptible to symbolic reading, especially of a theological kind". (p. 27)[1]

He isolates three authors, alongside Frankl himself, as making the "last attempts of Hegelian cultural history to translate 'style' into 'mind' and to trace the theological implications of the cathedral back to a single unifying force at the centre of medieval culture".[2] The books he refers to, all published in the wake of the end of World War II, are Erwin Panofsky's two great ventures into the Gothic, *Abbot Suger: On the Abbey Church of St Denis and Its Art Treasures* (1946) and *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (1951),[3] Hans Sedlmayr's *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* (1950),[4] Otto von Simson's *The Gothic Cathedral* (1956),[5] and Paul Frankl's own books – not only *Gothic Architecture* (written between 1947 and 1956) but above all *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations Through Eight Centuries* (1960).[6] They constitute the "Golden Age" of my title – for they represent the last moment that art historians with a universalist range of interests across the entirety of the discipline in its western guise from antiquity to modernity, paid close attention to Gothic. These books are anything but narrow, specific or targeted at the minutiae of architectural structure and design, as were those of the generation which followed and reacted against them – the generation of what Crossley calls "the positivist optimism of the post war years" (p. 30).[7] The interest of these books, apart from the academic pathologist's curious professional fascination in the disinterring of ancestral corpses,[8] lies in the fact that all are heavily ideological. The nature of their differing ideological takes is what I shall focus on.

* This paper is for Paul Crossley – Courtauld comrade in arms, guide on my travels (even, I discovered, examiner for my MA thesis), lover of the big picture, friend. The scholarly archaeology it unpacks is not only in relation to Paul's Frankl, but also more personally to the strange experience of being interviewed by Paul's own teacher, Peter Kidson, in 1985 for a place on the Courtauld MA. Naively, I volunteered to talk about Chartres (knowing the church but not its literature) and found myself willy-nilly in the strange world – strange to an outsider – of the Gothic cathedral and PK's resistance to the history of its Neoplatonic excess. Many thanks to Peg Olin, Anton Schütz, Rebecca Zorach for their comments.

[1] Paul Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, rev. Paul Crossley, New Haven, 2000, p. 27. See also Paul Crossley, "The Integrated Cathedral: Thoughts on 'Holism' and Gothic Architecture", in *The Four Modes of Seeing : Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan & Ellen M. Shortell, Farnham, 2009, p. 157-173, esp. p. 162-164.

[2] Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, rev. Crossley, p. 27.

[3] Erwin Panofsky, *Abbot Suger: On the Abbey Church of St Denis and Its Art Treasures*, Princeton, 1946 and Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, Latrobe, 1951; with e.g. Bruno Reudenbach "Panofsky und Suger von St Denis", in *Erwin Panofsky: Beiträge des Symposions, Hamburg 1992*, ed. Bruno Reudenbach, Berlin, 1994, p. 109-122 and Christoph Markschies, *Gibt es eine 'Theologie der gotischen Kathedrale'? Nochmals: Suger von Saint-Denis und Sankt Dionys von Areopag* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1, 1995), Heidelberg, 1995, p. 13-23.

[4] Hans Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, Zurich, 1950.

[5] Otto Von Simson, *Medieval Concept of Order*, New York, 1956, with Markschies, *Gibt es eine 'Theologie der gotischen Kathedrale'?*, p. 23-39.

[6] Paul Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, Harmondsworth, 1962 and Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations Through Eight Centuries*, Princeton, 1960.

[7] Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, rev. Paul Crossley, see also his earlier reference to "post-war positivism", p. 23.

[8] I quote (and embroider) a comment made to me by Cyril Mango in relation to a paper I gave on the historiography of early Christian art; but my embroidery owes much to Roger Dawe, *Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus*, Leiden, 1965, p. 3 – this last being an entirely gratuitous reference to a Fellow of Trinity and thus to our honorand's Trinitarian academic origins!

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100126

Rightly, from the perspective of a new century (Crossley's Frankl was published in 2000), Crossley puts our four protagonists *together* as Hegelians (p. 28), historicists "to borrow Karl Popper's pejorative term" (p. 15) who were collectively responsible for the methodological shift by which "at a stroke, neo-platonism replaced the rib-vault in the genesis of Gothic architecture" (p. 28).[9] Crossley argues that, taken together, Panofsky's integration of architecture with medieval scholasticism, and especially his emphasis on "Abbot Suger's infatuation with the 'light metaphysics' of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite", alongside Sedlmayr's suggestion that the Gothic cathedral was a literal copy of the Heavenly Jerusalem, led to a powerful focus on St Denis, not least in von Simson's book and in much later writing (p. 27-28).[10] In the final part of *Gothic Architecture*, Frankl climaxes on these themes with sections on "Symbols of Meaning", "Form Symbols", "The Gothic Style and Scholasticism" and "The Root of the Gothic Style" (this last section deeply essentialist). Frankl's survey book culminates on a mix of romantic mysticism (with quite a bit on the Holy Grail), the immanence of spirituality in form and several historiographically striking references to *Weltanschauung*, the *Geistesgeschichte* of Max Dvořak and – in tying the specific details of material forms to the big ideas – Alois Riegl's charged and controversial concept of *Kunstwollen*.[11]

But the differences between our four players – intellectually, in terms of education and training, and above all in the history of their politics – repay a closer examination. Let us begin with the post-war moment. Not only are their works written in the aftermath of the War, but the four authors – all hugely impressive intellects from the glorious centre of German *Kunstgeschichte* and two of them (Panofsky and Sedlmayr) among the leaders of the key divergent art historical traditions (namely, what have come to be seen as the Warburg and Vienna Schools) – had charged relations with the recent political and historical past. Panofsky (1892-1968) and Frankl (1878-1962), both Jews, had been stripped of their chairs, respectively in Hamburg and Halle-Wittenberg, by the Nazi race laws of 1933 and had both fled into American exile before the outbreak of war in 1939.[12] In the 1940s both were at the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, their work on Gothic clearly being of mutual interest.[13] Von

[9] See also Willibald SAUERLÄNDER, "Gothic Art Reconsidered: New Aspects and Open Questions", in *The Cloisters: Studies in Honor of the 50th Anniversary*, ed. Elizabeth PARKER & Mary SHEPHERD, New York, 1992, p. 26-40, esp. p. 27. Note that Panofsky is usually characterised as Kantian rather than Hegelian – e.g. Michael PODRO, *The Critical Historians of Art*, New Haven, 1982, p. 181-182; Michael Ann HOLLY, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*, Ithaca, 1984, p. 91-92, 147-152; Paul CROWTHER, *The Transhistorical Image*, Cambridge, 2002, p. 70-73; Katharina LORENZ & Jaś ELSNER ,"Translators' Introduction" to Erwin PANOFSKY, "On the Relationship of Art History and Art Theory", in *Critical Inquiry*, 35, 2008, p. 33-42. But it may be the case that late Panofsky (Iconological Panofsky) is more Hegelian than his earlier incarnation in Germany.

[10] Writing elsewhere of Panofsky, Sedlmayr and von Simson, CROSSLEY says "Simson's book was the last attempt to provide an overall ideological explanation for Gothic architecture"; see Paul CROSSLEY, "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: The Limits of Iconography", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 130, 1988, p. 116-121, esp. p. 120-121

[11] For Dvořak and *Weltanschauung*, see FRANKL, *Gothic Architecture* (1962), p. 268 (also FRANKL, *Gothic Architecture* (2000) p. 299); on Dvořák, who is now undergoing something of a revival, see e.g. Matthew RAMPLEY, "Max Dvořák: Art History and the Crisis of Modernity", in *Art History*, 26, 2003, p. 214-237 and Ján BAKOS, "Max Dvořák – A Neglected revisionist", in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, 2004, p. 55-72. For *Kunstwollen*, see FRANKL, *Gothic Architecture* (1962) p. 252 and 259 (FRANKL, *Gothic Architecture* (2000) p. 290 and p. 294); on the concept and its ramifications see e.g. Margaret OLIN, *Forms of Representation in Alois Riegl's Theory of Art*, University Park, 1992, p. 71-72, p. 129-153; Andrea REICHENBERGER, *Riegls 'Kunstwollen': Versuch einer Neubetrachtung*, Sankt Augustin, 2003; Matthew GUBSER, *Time's Visible Surface: Alois Riegl and the Discourse on History and Temporality in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, Detroit, 2006, p. 153-161; Jaś ELSNER, "From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture: Some Reflections on Riegl's Concept of *Kunstwollen*", in *Critical Inquiry*, 32, 2006, p. 741-766.

[12] For FRANKL, see Ulrike WENDLAND, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil*, Munich, 1999, vol. 1, p. 152-157; for Panofsky, see *ibidem*, vol. 2, p. 484-497.

[13] FRANKL thanks Panofsky for checking his translations in FRANKL, *The Gothic*, p. vi, while PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, p. viii thanks FRANKL for some drawings.

Simson (1912-1993), a promising scholar not yet with a chair by 1939, was also an émigré to America but from a very different background.[14] A Roman Catholic convert from Lutheranism, although his ancestry was distantly Jewish, he moved in a highly patrician milieu – his father had been a minister in the German foreign office before the Nazi era and his wife was a princess. In 1939, rather than be drafted into the German military von Simson got out to America with his family, ending up as Professor in the University of Chicago in the Committee on Social Thought. Unlike Frankl and Panofsky, von Simson chose to return to (West) Germany in 1957 to the University of Frankfurt and ultimately to the chair in Berlin. By contrast, Sedlmayr (1896-1984) was probably the most brilliant and distinguished art historian to have been an active and committed Nazi in the Third Reich.[15] In 1945 he was dismissed from his chair at Vienna (Riegl's chair) and, taking up what has been characterised as a reactionary Catholic ultraconservatism,[16] he wrote two books – his bestseller attacking modern art, *Der Verlust der Mitte* (1948),[17] and *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* (1950). In 1951, partly as a result of this flurry of publication, he was rehabilitated and appointed to the chair of art history at Munich (Wölfflin's chair).[18]

This foray into personal histories – apparently well outside the specific questions and temporal frame of Gothic – serves to emphasize one issue. None of our protagonists writing in the 1940s and 1950s could be anything but deeply invested in the huge upheavals of their own native land, in the death and ruin that took place there, in the collapse of German-speaking culture and in the turmoil that Nazism had inflicted on their chosen academic discipline and profession. Such things need not always influence a scholar's work. But the case I make here is that this personal history in the context of the tumultuous ideological and political events in their native Europe cannot be separated from an agenda-driven approach to the writing of our four protagonists, at any rate in relation to the problems of Gothic.[19] The question of what their various agendas were and of why should so many of the survivors of the rubble of *Kunstgeschichte* have turned to the Gothic is an interesting one. But before going there, we must remind ourselves of the unusual attraction of the Gothic for agenda-driven arguments.

[14] For von Simson, see Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker*, vol. 2, p. 643-649.

[15] Generally on Sedlmayr's biography, see Eva Frodl-Kraft, "Hans Sedlmayr (1896-1984)", in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 44, 1991, p. 7-46 (a virtual whitewash of his Nazism) and Norbert Schneider, "Hans Sedlmayr (1896-1984)", in *Altmeister moderner Kunstgeschichte*, ed. Heinrich Dilly, Berlin, 1999, p. 267-288. For an interesting discussion of his career, see Christopher Wood, "Introduction" to *The Vienna School Reader*, New York, 2000, p. 9-81, esp. p. 36-38 and 43-53. Specifically on the question of his Nazism, see esp. Hans Aurenhammer, "Zäsur oder Kontinuität? Das Wiener kunsthistorische Institut im Ständestaat und im Nationalsozialismus", in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, 2004, p. 11-54, esp. 25-49 and Benjamin Binstock, "Springtime for Sedlmayr? The Future of Nazi Art History", in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, 2004, p. 73-86. On art history in the Third Reich, see Heinrich Dilly, *Deutscher Kunsthistoriker 1933-45*, Berlin, 1988 and Jonathan Petropoulos, *The Faustian Bargain*, London, 2000, p. 165-214.

[16] See Wood, "Introduction", p. 36 and Binstock, "Springtime for Sedlmayr?", p. 74; also Thomas Zaunschirm, "Sedlmayr ohne Gott", in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, 2004, p. 247-254.

[17] Hans Sedlmayr, *Verlust der Mitte*, Salzburg, 1948, translated and published as *Art in Crisis: the Lost Centre*, London, 1957.

[18] On post war German art history, the impact of *Verlust der Mitte* and the rehabilitation of Sedlmayr, see Willibald Sauerländer, "Von den 'Sonderleistungen deutscher Kunst' zur 'Ars Sacra': Kunstgeschichte in Deutschland 1945-1950", in *Wissenschaft im geteilten Deutschland: Restauration oder Neubeginn nach 1945?*, ed. Walter Pehle & Peter Sillem, Frankfurt, 1992, p. 177-190.

[19] See Andreas Speer, "Is there a Theology of the Gothic Cathedral? A Rereading of Abbot Suger's Writings on the Abbey Church of St Denis", in *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger & Anne-Marie Bouché, Princeton, 2006, p. 65-83, esp. p. 66 on Panofsky's humanism as a response to World War II.

Paul Crossley reminds us, in the conclusion to his account of the achievement and significance of Frankl's work, that "each age builds its own Gothic cathedral" (p. 30). In fact, no one was more deeply learned in precisely this point than Paul Frankl himself, since his *The Gothic* constitutes a near-900 page exemplification of this issue and the huge changes in interpretation to which the Gothic has been subject. We must remember that the very term "Gothic" is derogatory – arising from a long and polemical Renaissance literature against the Goths' perceived agency in the decline of Classical forms.[20] The most influential statement on this was Vasari's attack on the Gothic in his *Lives*.[21] But what matters for my purposes is the constant association in this polemical literature between the Gothic (whatever is meant precisely or generally by that) and the Germans. As Frankl puts it, going back as early as the fourteenth century:

> "Petrarch does not seem to have expressed this theory of the barbaric origins of Gothic so explicitly and pointedly, but it has its root in his nationalistic construction of history. Even today it is not dead. Not only in Romance countries is there a kind of unspoken agreement that German art is barbaric…".[22]

In the context of the remarkable excesses of interpretative racism that characterise the build-up to National Socialism,[23] the long literature of the German association with Gothic could be swung to the positive in order to imbue the Gothic with a Nordic Aryan purity,[24] encapsulated by the towers and castle of Nuremberg that offered so impressive a backdrop to some of Adolf Hitler's more memorable rallies.[25] Hitler himself had written in *Mein Kampf*:

> "Only if we compare the dimensions of the ancient state structures with contemporary dwelling houses can we understand the overpowering sweep and force of this emphasis on the principle of giving first place to public works. The few still towering colossuses which we admire in the ruins and wreckage of the ancient world are not former business palaces, but temples and state structures; in other words, works whose owner was the community… . Even the Germanic Middle Ages upheld the same guiding principle, though amid totally different conceptions of art. What in antiquity found its expression in the Acropolis or the Pantheon now cloaked itself in the forms of the Gothic cathedral. Like giants these monumental structures towered over the swarming frame, wooden and brick buildings of the medieval city, and thus become symbols which even today… determine the character and picture of these towns".[26]

The movement from the Parthenon via the Pantheon to the Gothic Cathedral in the Germanic Middle Ages as paradigms of communal collectivism given to an overpowering sweep of towering monumental structures says it all, in the language of rhetorical flourishes. But the argument is rooted

[20] See Frankl *The Gothic*, p. 237-414, esp. p. 290-294 on Vasari who is key to the later discourse. Also relevant in the context of this paper is Panofsky's interesting essay "Das erste Blatt aus dem 'Libro' Giogrio Vasaris: Eine Studie über die Beurteilung der Gotik in der italienischen Renaissance mit einem Exkurs über zwei Fassadenprojekte Domenico Becafumis", in *Städel-Jahrbuch*, 6, 1930, p. 25-72 (published also as: Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, New York, 1955, p. 169-235).

[21] Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite (1550)*, ed. Gaetano Milanesi, vol. 1 , Florence, 1878, p. 137, with e.g. in Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "National Stereotypes, Prejudice and Aesthetic Judgments in the Historiography of Art", in *Art History, Aesthetics, Visual Studies*, ed. Michael Ann Holly & Keith Moxey, New Haven, 2002, p. 71-84, esp. p. 72-73.

[22] Frankl *The Gothic*, p. 239.

[23] On art history, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, Chicago, 2004, p. 68-91.

[24] It is strange how this Germanic theme has been all but forgotten. It hardly appears in e.g. Conrad Rudolph's strongly historiographic edited volume, *A Companion to Medieval Art*, Oxford, 2006.

[25] See e.g. *Kulissen der Gewalt: Das Reichsparteitagsgelände Nürnberg*, Munich, 1992, e.g. p. 109 for photographs of Nazi rallies in the Hauptmarkt with its backdrop of German Gothic buildings, renamed Adolf-Hitler-Platz.

[26] Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, [1925], London, 1992, p. 241.

in a Pan-Germanic and overtly nationalistic (if not initially directly politicized) scholarly tradition that attempted to ground Gothic in the *Kunstwollen* of the German race or to derive it from the pure Nordic and Aryan past.[27]

In 1911, Wilhelm Worringer published *Formprobleme der Gotik*,[28] which built on the way his famous book (and doctoral thesis) of 1908, *Abstraktion und Einfühlung*,[29] had reformulated Riegl's *Kunstwollen* as rising from the psychological instincts ultimately rooted in race.[30] For Worringer, already in *Abstraktion und Einfühlung*, the Gothic Cathedral with its "strong appeal to our capacity for empathy" brought the "indigenous *Kunstwollen* which we observed in ornamental art, and which we summarised by the formula 'heightened expression on an organic foundation'… to fulfilment and apotheosis".[31] By the time he wrote *Formprobleme*, Worringer posited the notion of "Gothic Man" as different from "Primitive", "Classical" and "Oriental Man" and as located in Northern and Central Europe.[32] His Gothic Man – transcendental in expression, transfigured in the psychology of scholasticism and mysticism – is German,[33] while the spirit or essence of Gothic appears both before and after the breakdown of Gothic style (which is anyway only a system that first arose in France)[34] in Baroque and Northern Classicism.[35] Gothic here comes close to the formal expression of a mystical essence that was the specific characteristic of German Man. In 1918, Josef Strzygowski (one of Sedlmayr's predecessors and teachers in Vienna) derived the key features of Gothic architecture – in particular, pointed arches, buttressing and ribbed vaults – from Armenian (which is to say, Aryan)[36] architecture in central Asia.[37] Infusing the undoubted enterprise, empiricism and acuity of Strzygowski's breadth of expertise and range of knowledge is a romantic conviction in the "Aryan energy" and spirit of the North, by contrast with the "Southern spirit" not to speak of "Semitic Art",[38] which not only clouds the interpretative judgments guiding his work, but also provides a teleology resilient even to empirical disproof.[39] The awfulness of Strzygowski's positions cannot nonetheless undermine his signal significance as the founder of numerous sub-disciplines in art history – not least the study of Jewish, Islamic and Armenian art, let alone that of the Christian east.[40]

[27] For Pan-Germanicism and it occult roots, see Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism: Secret Aryan Cults and Their Influence on Nazi Ideology*, London, 1992, p. 7-16 and esp. p. 106-122, p. 186-191 for romantic medievalism as a part of this package.

[28] Wilhelm Worringer, *Formprobleme der Gotik*, Munich, 1911 (published also as *Form in Gothic*, London, 1927).

[29] Wilhelm Worringer, *Abstraktion und Einfühling*, Munich, 1908 (published also as *Abstraction and Empathy*, New York, 1953).

[30] On the race issue, see Frankl, *The Gothic*, p. 669-670 and Ann Stieglitz, "The Reproduction of Agony: Toward a Reception-History of Grünewald's Isenheim Altar after the First World War", in *Oxford Art Journal*, 12, 1989, p. 87-103, esp. p. 88-89. The theme is underplayed in *Invisible Cathedrals: the Expressionist Art History of Wilhelm Worringer*, ed. Neil Donahue, University Park, 1995.

[31] Worringer, *Abstraction and Empathy*, p. 112.

[32] Worringer, *Form in Gothic*, p. 38. For a brief account of *Formprobleme*, see Joanna Ziegler, "Worringer's Theory of Transcendental Space in Gothic Architecture: A Medievalist's Perspective", in *Invisible Cathedrals*, p. 105-118.

[33] See Wilhelm Schlink, "The Gothic Cathedral as Heavenly Jerusalem: A Fiction in German Art History", in *Jewish Art*, 23-24, 1997-1998, p. 275-285, esp. p. 278.

[34] Worringer, *Form in Gothic*, p. 41.

[35] *Ibidem*, p. 180-181 – the last and concluding paragraphs to his text.

[36] On the Aryan issue, see Christina Maranci, *Medieval Armenian Architecture: Constructions of Race and Nation*, Leuven, 2001, p. 116-118.

[37] See esp. Josef Strzygowski, *Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa*, Vienna, 1918, vol. 2, p. 814-827 with Maranci, *Medieval Armenian Architecture*, p. 143-158; also Josef Strzygowski, *Origin of Christian Church Art*, Oxford, 1923, p. 93-97.

[38] Quotes from Strzygowski, *Origin of Christian Church Art*, p. vii-viii.

[39] For the polemic between Strzygowski and Frankl on ribbed vaulting, see Frankl, *The Gothic*, p. 743-744. Further on Strzygowski, see Suzanne Marchand, "The Rhetoric of Artifacts and the Decline of Classical Humanism: The Case of Josef Strzygowski", in *History and Theory: Theme Issue*, 33, 1994, p. 106-130.

[40] See for instance, Ernst Dielz, "Zur Kritik Strzygowskis", in *Kunst des Orients*, 4, 1963, p. 98-109; Maranci, *Medieval Armenian Architecture*; Stephen Kile, "'South Opposed to East and North': Adrian Stokes and Josef Strzygowski. A Study in the Aesthetics and Historiography of Orientalism", in *Art History*, 26, 2003, p. 505-532; Steven Fine, *Art and Judaism in the Roman World*, Cambridge, 2005, p. 32-33.

Worringer and Strzygowski represent highly influential interventions in the Germanic theme (works by both were translated into English in the 1920s), on which Nazi art history in the 1930s was to build its own still cruder edifice of the Gothic spirit of Germany.[41] But they also reflect divergent academic traditions in the German-speaking world whose interpretative instincts in the cultural context of the first third of the twentieth century find themselves cohering on racial lines. Worringer goes deep into a psychology of form that roots itself in the German context; Strzygowski ranges wide into the Aryan origins of Germany in the deep North, chasing formal parallels. Both owe much to Riegl – Worringer to the metaphysics of *Kunstwollen*, Strzygowski to the model of Riegl's great history of the transmission of ornamental motifs, *Stilfragen*.[42] Some of the differences are brought out in Frankl's account in *The Gothic*, which is anything but an attempt to be objective. Frankl has great respect for Worringer's "brilliant book" (p. 670), giving a whole chapter to the "Gothic Man" (p. 669-680), while he excoriates the "misguided theses" (p. 743) of Strzygowski in a chapter devoted to "Modern Aberrations" (743-748). Deep affiliations lie here. Worringer was, like Frankl, a Munich student of Wölfflin, but fundamentally influenced by Riegl. His theoretical explorations of form are in some ways parallel to Frankl's own masterpiece, *Das System der Kunstwissenschaft*, which (at over 1000 pages) has been acclaimed the most profound and systematic study of style ever undertaken.[43] Strzygowski, perhaps Riegl's greatest single opponent, was nonetheless the great pioneer and empiricist who saw every building and its interconnections (some more supposed than real) with the other buildings in the group he had chosen to study. In this he resembles the Frankl of the bulk of *Gothic Architecture*. Strzygowski's overt Nazism make him an easy target; it is, however, in Frankl's difficulties in treating Worringer's text in the years after the Holocaust but in the context of a deep intellectual respect that some of the fissures in Frankl's own theoretical and perhaps also unconscious positions are most apparent.[44] On the one hand: "Could the creation of 'Gothic' art be regarded then as the surest blood test of an Aryan? Or does this naïve theory simply fall into the category of vicious circles?" (p. 672); on the other hand: "Scientific thinking must object to [Worringer's] formulation of concepts in the minor key, but this does not preclude a feeling of respect for his intensity despite all its contradictoriness. He touched a deeper layer of the problems of form than many another scholar, and we, too, must seek to delve into this layer…" (p. 679).

It is only with some sense of the full awfulness of "Gothic" in its German meanings before 1945 that the impulse of our four protagonists' work and its apologetic impetus can be grasped. The shift of focus to origins in Suger's St Denis is simultaneously a move from Germany to France and from the real world (whether that is seen as the Germanic ideology of Aryan pasts or the specificities of vaults

[41] See e.g. Robert TAYLOR, *The Word in Stone: the Role of Architecture in National Socialist Ideology*, Berkeley, 1974, p. 92-97 and esp. SCHLINK, "The Gothic Cathedral as Heavenly Jerusalem". Note that the (Roman) Catholic element in Gothic art was always a problem for the Nazis, since it always smacked of the South – e.g. TAYLOR, *The Word in Stone*, p. 58 quoting Alfred Rosenberg: "The German Cathedrals were not built by Catholics… they are the creation of the German race"; also p. 40 – Hitler disliked the Church but liked the Germanness of Gothic (as in Strasbourg Cathedral); p. 58 – Alfred Rosenberg's comment "The Führer does not like Gothic"; p. 277 – the avoidance of Gothic as a Nazi style in building.

[42] Alois RIEGL, *Stilfragen*, Vienna, 1893 = *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament*, Princeton, 1992. For discussion, see Ernst GOMBRICH, *The Sense of Order*, London, 1984, p. 180-194; OLIN, *Forms of Representation*, p. 60-89; Margaret IVERSEN, *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory*, Cambridge, MA, 1993, p. 49-63; Joaquin LORDA, "Problems of Style: Riegl's Problematic Foundations", in *Framing Formalism: Riegl's Work*, ed. Richard WOODFIELD, Amsterdam, 2001, p. 107-134; CROWTHER, *The Transhistorical Image*, p. 22-35.

[43] Paul FRANKL, *Das System der Kunstwissenschaft*, Brno, 1938. See Meyer SCHAPIRO, "Style", in "*Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist, and Society*", New York, 1994, p. 51-102, esp. p. 73-74.

[44] On FRANKL's own ventures into racial art history in the 1930s and his explicit debts to Worringer and Strzygowski (among others) see KAUFMANN, *Toward a Geography of Art*, p. 83-85.

and buttresses) to an ideal Neoplatonic world of spiritual or scholastic immanence. This is much more than the last stand of ideological art history. It is a redemption of Gothic itself from the clutches of Aryanism and the psychic drives of the Germanic North, as well as being a sanctification of (the ruins of) European culture in the wake of the greatest catastrophe ever to befall it. Gothic is no longer German, but pan-European, and it is spiritual.

Here we find a curious puzzle. The broad projects of our four protagonists appear essentially compatible. But that is by no means how *they* saw it. The history of academic training and rival schools in pre-War Germany and Austria collides with the personal histories of men disenfranchised or fêted in the Third Reich. Von Simson, not a Jew and not a Warburgian, baldly dismisses Panofsky in a footnote, while he praises Sedlmayr as "rich in fruitful observations".[45] Frankl, who had originally planned to close *The Gothic* in 1944 (800 years after Suger had written *De Conservatione*, p. v), refers frequently to Panofsky in his notes and once to von Simson (though not to the latter's book of 1956). But he could not resist a long and somewhat hysterical attack on Sedlmayr's "recent sensational book" (p. 753) as the climax of his chapter on "Modern Aberrations" (p. 753-759). Frankl may write of the "loss of commonsense: up is down, abstract is concrete… he fights abstract concepts and creates new ones, he confounds architecture with painting, partly with poetry" (p. 759); but it is hard to avoid the impression that the true modern aberration of this chapter featuring Strzygowski and Sedlmayr is National Socialism itself.[46] Sedlmayr refers frequently to Panofsky (and to other émigré Jewish scholars like Gerhard Ladner and Frankl)[47] in a text which is rather unpolemical for so inveterate a controversialist. In the 1976 afterword published with the 1988 reprinting of *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*,[48] Sedlmayr claims that Panofsky laid the ground work for the understanding of the "spiritual structure of the Cathedral" which was developed by von Simson (in an article of 1948 which underpinned his 1956 book) and culminated in Sedlmayr's own book of 1950.[49] Given the long history of academic enmity and competition between Panofsky and Sedlmayr – especially over the question of how to read Riegl's legacy and the fundamental theoretical problem of the predominance of *form* (in the Sedlmayrian formulation of *Struktur*) versus *meaning* (Panofsky's *Sinn*) – through the 1920s and 30s,[50] the spectacle of the two singing from the same hymn-sheet in the ideal Cathedral of the Mind – at precisely the point where their scholarly interests most closely converge on Gothic and the post War moment when their personal relations with the past could not be more polarised – is remarkable.[51]

But we may suppose that the personal impulses underlying the turn to Gothic in all our players were not the same. For Sedlmayr – writing himself back into the profession and out of the lepers'

45 See Von Simson, *The Gothic Cathedral*, p. xx-xxi, n.3.

46 Hysteria among post War survivor art historians in response to Sedlmayr is not confined to Frankl. On Gombrich, see Elsner, "From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture", p. 763-764.

47 See the references in his index. Note that at 581 Panofsky is curiously accorded the wrong first name of "Ernst".

48 Hans Sedlmayr, "Ein Nachwort als Einführung (1976): Die Enstehung der Gotik und der Fortschritt der Kunstgeschichte", in Hans Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, Graz, 1988, p. 585-614.

49 Sedlmayr, "Ein Nachwort als Einführung (1976)", p. 598.

50 See Elsner, "From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture", p. 758-762 for some discussion.

51 Old habits die hard though: Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* (1950) p. 328-348 remains a chase for "Nordic", "Celtic" and "Southern" elements in the Gothic, and one wonders how far his spiritual cathedral really is from the aesthetics (if not the overt politics) of Albert Speer's famous "Cathedral of Light" erected on the Zeppelin Field of Nuremberg for Hitler's rallies, on which see Taylor, *The Word in Stone*, p. 170-171, also Schlink "The Gothic Cathedral as Heavenly Jerusalem", p. 275-285. On the convergence of Sedlmayr and Panofsky on Gothic, see Willibald Sauerländer, "'Barbari ad portas': Panofsky in den fünfziger Jahren", in *Erwin Panofsky: Beiträge des Symposions*, p. 123-137, esp. p. 126-127; Pierre Bourdieu, "Postface" to Erwin Panofsky, *Architecture gothique et pensée scholastique*, Paris, 1967, p. 135-1667, esp. 135-137; Wood, "Introduction", p. 46-47.

ghetto to which confirmed Nazis could be so enthusiastically dismissed after the War – the redemption of Gothic was hardly separable from self-redemption. Being nice to Jewish exiles was scarcely impolitic and the spiritualization of Gothic was an imperative in his renewed Catholic identity. For Panofsky and Frankl, one cannot help wondering how much their own survival was touched by survivor's guilt. The great complexity of their works – where, in Panofsky's case "scholastic dialectics have driven architectural thinking to a point where it almost ceased to be architectural",[52] and in Frankl's case the vast unwieldiness of *The Gothic* as a compendium of contradictory views, speaks to an ambivalence about straightforward actualities and a preference for the abstract and intellectual – may be less the symptom of an academic style now distant to modern tastes than about a certain kind of denial. Von Simson, caught between Germany and America and less in thrall to a distinctly personal investment in the events of 1933-1945, put the issue with the greatest clarity:

> [The] "aspect… we may perhaps call the archetypal orientation of medieval thinking. Ideas, and ideas alone, were real. Facts and things were real only insofar as they partook of the reality of ideas".[53]

Whatever one thinks of this as a proposition about the Middle Ages or about reality in general, a fundamental and personal denial of "facts and things" in the era of the Holocaust may have been the only way to survive for Jews, other refugees and (ex-) Nazis in the years after 1945.

We have been tracing a most peculiar history. Just as the Gothic had been oddly not just a metaphor but also the epitome of Nordic Aryanism, so in these deeply apologetic texts it becomes the metaphor and epitome of enlightened European spirituality. One might add that at the same moment the Nazi era itself was rapidly progressing into being the metaphor and epitome of evil incarnate. This new Gothic is a very long way from the mechanics of rib vaults, wall joins, pointed arches and flying buttresses. When the reaction set in, it came from scholars whose only response to theories of Gothic Aryanism would have been disbelieving laughter and who therefore had none of our protagonists' reasons for going Neoplatonic. But when Occam's razor was applied to the Neoplatonism and spirituality, unfortunately all that was left were the rib vaults.[54] Without some kind of Panofskian Iconology or Sedlmayrian *Strukturforschung*, formalist positivism offered its topic no heart, no spirit, no blood and earth beyond the ribs, save only a bland historical contextualisation or the acuity of its demolition of previous speculations. In the case of medieval architecture, Gothic became of interest only to that small group of consenting adults with a particular fetish for the Middle Ages. The question posed for us by the extraordinary moment when Panofsky and Sedlmayr speak as one, is whether the rejection of their collective voice leaves us with an art history that is sufficient. What, we might ask, does the denial of contemporary investment (as in the German art history of the pre-War years through to the deaths of its great exponents after the War) itself deny?

[52] Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, p. 88 – the book's concluding sentence. It is worth noting that of all German art historians in the 1920s and 1930s, Panofsky was always seen as on the cerebral and abstract end.

[53] Von Simson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 133. Connoisseurs of Chicago's Committee on Social Thought might also recognise the resonances in this kind of thing.

[54] The most brilliant wielder of the razor was Peter Kidson, appropriately trained as a Cambridge philosopher who had sat at Russell's feet in his youth. See Peter Kidson, "Panofsky, Suger and St Denis", in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 20, 1987, p. 1-17. Ostensibly Kidson's target was Panofsky, but his most excoriating footnotes are reserved for von Simson (n. 32, 33 and 36). Curiously, he mentions Sedlmayr as one of Panofsky's epigoni "ready to leap in and spell out the consequences" (p. 3). Support for Kidson's assault is Markschies, *Gibt es eine 'Theologie der gotischen Kathedrale'?*, p. 46-65; a nuanced historicising reading of the relevant medieval texts with great care taken to avoid succumbing to a Panofskian scholastic or Sedlmayrian spiritual *Zeitgeist* is Conrad Rudolph, *Artistic Change at St-Denis*, Princeton, 1990.

The collective challenge of Frankl, Panofsky, Sedlmayr and von Simson is to foreground a fundamental problematic in art history itself. If you strip away the investments and ideologies from art historical writing, what is left? The testament to the field's broader loss of the big picture is the closure of western medieval art posts the world over, as the subject risks passing into a tiny specialist corner. But if you hold to the investments in ideas, to an art history beyond von Simson's "facts and things", you run the risks of such unstable and sometimes awful conceptual edifices as the ones we have been tip-toeing around in this essay.

Systems of Length in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*

Eric Fernie

The lengths most widely used in the eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period contain, as might be expected, elements from both the Egyptian and Greek traditions. How those elements were combined and the subsequent history of the Hellenistic measures is the subject of this paper. As a basis for analysing them I shall start with a brief account of the Egyptian, Greek, and Roman traditions. I have restricted myself to shorter lengths, both because they are more amenable to accurate treatment and because the longer measures, those of an agricultural and itinerary type, introduce problems of an entirely different kind, not least those of astronomy.

1. The Egyptian, Greek, and Roman systems

The metrological systems of the Mediterranean basin in Antiquity all included anatomical measures such as the digit, palm and cubit. In terms of agreed or standard lengths, however, they fall firmly into two categories, those for which values can be established with almost complete certainty, as with the Egyptian and the Roman, and those which are characterised by almost complete chaos, as with the Babylonian and the Greek. The explanation for the distinction is probably the obvious one, that the Egyptian and Roman states were run, one for millennia and the other for centuries, by unified and efficient bureaucracies, while Mesopotamia was a mosaic of cultures and dynasties and pre-Hellenistic Greece could not be described as centrally controlled.

The Egyptian system consisted of four digits forming a palm and six palms forming a cubit, the three units being respectively a finger breadth, a palm breadth and the distance from the elbow to the fingertips. There was also a royal cubit of seven palms. The evidence for the actual lengths exists in the form of rods retrieved from royal tombs of the third and second millennia BC, of which there are particularly good examples in the Archaeological Museum in Turin and in the Louvre, and units marked on the walls of the tombs. On this basis the ordinary six-palm cubit measures circa 45 centimetres, and the royal seven-palm cubit circa 52.25 centimetres (Figs 1 and 2).[1]

* As my knowledge of the fields in which Paul specialises is so limited there would be no point in my attempting to write on a relevant topic for this volume. I therefore hope he will accept something completely different. It comes with my unstinting admiration for him as a scholar, teacher and friend.

[1] For the Egyptian lengths see Friedrich Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, Berlin, 1882, and Richard Lepsius, *Die Längenmasse der Alten*, Berlin, 1884. The length of the Egyptian royal cubit was first established by Sir Isaac Newton in somewhat curious circumstances, curious because he arrived at the right answer despite a) working from inaccurate dimensions for the Great Pyramid (I mean inaccurate by more than the length of a cricket pitch), and b) having to make guesses at two important stages in his analysis. He none the less calculated the equivalent in English feet of the respectable figure of 52.79 centimetres. This is slightly high by modern standards, so it is little short of amazing that, in a different context, discussing the Jewish cubit, Newton describes his figure as an upper limit, a statement from which no-one is now likely to dissent. How did Newton manage this? It is possible that he owned a cubit rod but did not wish to declare the fact, though it is difficult to think of a motive for this. Another explanation is that his cabalistic contacts gave him the right answer, and that he worked back from it to the flawed physical evidence. Newton's text, "The cubit of Memphis from the dimensions of the Great Pyramid", is available, translated from the Latin, in *Miscellaneous Works of Mr John Greaves*, ed. Thomas Birch, London, 1737, vol. 2, p. 408-411. The comment on the upper limit is on p. 428. The point was originally commented on as far as I know by George Sarton, "The Egyptian Cubit", in *Isis*, 25, 1936, p. 399-402.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100127

Fig. 1. Names of units used in the Egyptian, Greek and Roman systems of length regardless of absolute dimensions (Eric Fernie)

Fig. 2. Dimensions of Egyptian cubits (Eric Fernie)

The Greeks used the same three anatomical units plus a foot of four palms and a fathom (the distance between the finger-tips of outstretched arms) of six feet. Numerous writers from Hesiod to Pollux name the units and in some cases explain how they relate.[2] As to absolute lengths, the question "How long was the Greek foot?", which has been asked for at least four centuries without a conclusive result, is probably misconceived. A number of foot lengths have been proposed, of which only a few are attested, such as those of 32.8, 30.8 and 29.6 centimetres. The metrological relief from Salamis, of uncertain date but probably later than the middle of the fourth century BC, displays two foot lengths, of 32.8 and 30.8 centimetres.[3] That of 32.8 centimetres establishes the existence of a foot claimed to have been widely used in buildings before the third century BC. That of 30.8 centimetres can also be derived from Pliny's claim that the stade, a Greek measure of 600 feet, "is 125 of our paces, or 625 feet".[4] This has been read in two ways, as nothing more than a comparison of systems, and as a formula for calculating the length of at least one Greek foot. As the Roman foot of 29.6 centimetres multiplied by 625/600 equals 30.83 centimetres, the Salamis relief appears to settle the argument. The 29.6 centimetre length is known from a representation of a human footprint on a marble slab in the Ashmolean, dated by style to the middle of the fifth century BC. The slab is likely to have formed a lintel to a doorway and hence could not have been intended as a standard, so the two lengths on it cannot be accepted as unequivocal evidence. The other length, however, the 209 centimetre fathom between the fingertips of the representation of a man with outstretched arms, is an existing measure, as 209 centimetres equals four cubits of 52.25 centimetres. This may have been derived from the Egyptian royal cubit, especially as Herodotus refers to the cubit of Samos as being the same as the Egyptian (though he does not specify whether ordinary or royal). The 209 centimetre fathom and the 29.6 centimetre foot appear to belong to different systems, as there are seven feet of 29.6 centimetres in 209 centimetres, and there is no record in any system of a seven-foot fathom.[5]

Despite the fact that it post-dates the Hellenistic period, the Roman system is included here because much of the documentary evidence for that period is Roman in date and because Roman lengths are referred to as equivalents for the Hellenistic ones. As well as the digit, palm, foot and cubit, the Romans used the inch or thumb width, with three to the palm and twelve to the foot, and the pace, or double pace as we would understand it, of five feet. Sources for the system include Vitruvius in the late first century BC, Columella in the mid-first century AD, Balbus slightly later, and the *agrimensores* at various dates. The Roman foot is one of the best attested measures of the pre-modern world, as it survives in the form of numerous metal lengths and representations on funerary monuments of ar-

[2] For example, HERODOTUS, *Histories* (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1960, vol. 1, p. 60, 178; vol. 2, p. 149 ; and Pollux, see Friedrich HULTSCH, *Metrologicorum Scriptorum Reliquiae*, 2 vols, Leipzig, 1864, 1866, vol. 1, p. 179 (hereafter *MSR*).

[3] Ifigenia DEKOULAKOU-SIDERIS, "A Metrological Relief from Salamis", in *American Journal of Archaeology*, 94, 1990, p. 445-451; Mark WILSON-JONES, "Doric Measure and Architectural Design 1: the Evidence of the Relief from Salamis", in *American Journal of Archaeology*, 104, 2000, p. 73-83.

[4] PLINY, *Natural History* (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1958-1962, vol. 2, p. 21, 85. Regarding those for and against the 30.83 centimetre foot, see Eric FERNIE, "Historical Metrology and Architectural History", in *Art History*, 1, 1978, p. 383-399, n. 11.

[5] Adolf MICHAELIS, "The Metrological Relief at Oxford", in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 4, 1883, p. 335-50; Burkhardt WESENBERG, "Zum metrologischen Relief in Oxford", in *Marburger Winckelmann-Programm*, 1975-1976, p. 15-22; Eric FERNIE, "The Greek Metrological Relief in Oxford", in *The Antiquaries Journal*, 61, 1981, p. 255-263. HERODOTUS, vol. 2, p. 1 and 9. The dimensions marked on columns at Didyma (which could be Greek, Hellenistic or Roman), previously thought to imply a foot of 29.6 centimetres, are now agreed to imply one of 29.9 centimetres (WILSON-JONES, "Doric Measure", p. 87).

chitects and surveyors. These give a range of 29.2 to 29.7 centimetres and an average value of 29.57 centimetres. It is not known whether it had any connection with the Greek foot of the same length on the Ashmolean slab.[6]

2. The Hellenistic system

In the period following the conquests of Alexander in the late fourth century BC two changes were introduced into the traditional Egyptian system. In what appears to be the primary one, the short, six-palm cubit of 45 centimetres was abandoned and the royal seven-palm one of 52.25 centimetres made into a standard cubit, divided into six new, longer palms (Fig. 2). A number of rods of this new type survive, including one of 52.36 centimetres in the British Museum of the third or second century BC, of uncertain provenance, and another from Dendera on the Nile, of similar date. A slab of the third century AD in the market at Leptis Magna includes a depiction of a six-palm cubit of 52.3 centimetres.[7] Didymus, an Alexandrian probably of the first century AD, describes a cubit which he calls Ptolemaic as equal to 1 4/5 Roman feet, giving it a length of 53.22 centimetres, and states that 3 1/3 Ptolemaic palms equal one Roman foot, giving a palm of 8.85 centimetres and a cubit of 53.12 centimetres. (The high figure of 53.22 centimetres as opposed to 52.25 centimetres is probably due to Didymus using the manageable fraction of four fifths in preference to the more accurate 77/100 of a Roman foot).[8] Although, according to Rostovzeff, the adjective "Ptolemaic" was never used in any document concerning measures under the Ptolemies themselves, the locations of the relevant monuments support Didymus's attribution of the system to the dynasty.[9]

The second change was the introduction of a foot length, presumably from the Greek system. This was calculated from the six-palm long cubit of 52.25 centimetres, producing, at four palms to six, a foot of 35 centimetres. An example of this length exists in the form of marks on columns in Alexandria datable to around 220 BC, which, when applied to the diameter of the columns, produce a foot of between 35.1 and 35.3 centimetres.[10] The introduction of a foot length makes sense in an accommodation of the Egyptian system, which lacked one, to the Greek, but the Greek connection explains neither the change to the six-palm long cubit, nor the establishing of a foot much longer than most of those apparently used in Greece. If the aim was to accommodate the Egyptian and Greek systems to one another, it would have been much more effective to take the short cubit of 45 centimetres and

[6] Vitruvius, *De architectura* (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1970, book 3, chapter 1, paragraphs 7-8; book 10, chapter 9, paragraph 4; book 1, chapter 6, paragraph 9; Columella, *De re rustica*, book 5, chapter 1: *MSR*, 2, p. 55; Balbus, *MSR*, vol. 2, p. 123-125; John Greaves, *A discourse of the Roman foote and denarius*, London, 1647; Matthew Raper, "Enquiry into the Measure of the Roman foot", in *Philosophical Transactions*, 51(ii), 1760, p. 774-823; Henry Stuart Jones, *A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome: the Museo Capitolino*, Oxford, 1912, p. 76.

[7] William Flinders Petrie, *Ancient Weights and Measures*, London, 1926, nos 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, and 11, 52.35-54.18 centimetres. There is a plaster replica of the Dendera slab in the Science Museum in London, 1931-149. Giovanni Ioppolo, "La tavola delle unità di misura nel mercato augusteo di Leptis Magna", in *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia*, 5, 1967, p. 89-98. There is a second cubit on the Leptis slab, of 51.7 centimetres, generally labelled "Punic". The minute difference between this and the Egyptian cubit, of only 6 to 9 millimetres, is an indication of the close attention paid in Antiquity to specific lengths, and that this is not a modern preoccupation imposed on the material.

[8] 1 4/5 Roman feet = 29.57 centimetres x 9/5 = 53.22 centimetres; 3 1/3 Ptolemaic palms = 29.57 centimetres, 29.57 divided by 3.34 = 8.85 centimetres per palm; x 6 = 53.12 centimetres. For Didymus see *MSR*, I, p. 180. On Ptolemaic lengths in general see Lepsius, *Längenmasse*, p. 75-90.

[9] Michael Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 1959, vol. 2, p. 1299. The Saite dynasty of the seventh and sixth centuries BC and the Persian occupation after 525 BC have also been proposed for the reform, but the cases are weak in themselves and doubly so when contrasted with that for the Hellenistic period.

[10] J. J. Coulton, "Towards Understanding Greek Temple Design", in *Annual of the British School at Athens*, 70, 1975, p. 59-99, p. 77, n. 73.

construct on it a foot with the Greek-like length of circa 30 centimetres. The fact that this was not done might suggest that the 45 centimetre cubit had dropped out of use before the arrival of Alexander. It is worth noting that Hyginus, a Roman *agrimensor* of the time of Trajan, describes what he called a Ptolemaic foot used in Cyrenaica which was half an inch longer than the Roman foot, that is, 29.57 x 25/24, or 30.8 centimetres. As this is the short foot of the Salamis slab and of Pliny's calculation, it brings a Greek dimension into the discussion.[11]

The Ptolemaic system is paralleled by another, called the Philetaireian. This is identified in the Heronian tables, so called from their attribution to Hero of Alexandria, of the second half of the first century AD: "The royal and Philetaireian foot equals 4 palms or 16 digits. The Italian foot equals 13 1/3 digits". Provided "Italian" means "Roman", the Philetaireian foot will measure 35 centimetres (29.6 x 16/13.34). The Heronian Tables are associated with Alexandria, but the name of the system connects it with Philetairos, founder of the state of Pergamon in the third century BC, hence paralleling in Seleucid Asia Minor the measuring systems of the Ptolemaic dynasty in Egypt.[12]

3. The systems of the eastern Roman Empire

The eastern half of the Roman Empire went from being one of two administrative units in the late third century, to the location of the capital of the Empire in 330, to having its own emperor from 395, and finally to becoming the Roman Empire itself after the end of the Western imperial line in 476. Given this description and the wholesale transfer of law and regulation, along with the Latin language, directly to Constantinople in the time of Constantine, one might expect the systems of length of the Roman Empire to continue unbroken into the sixth century, with the extant systems of the eastern Mediterranean gaining prominence, or at least holding their own, over the same period. Neither of these expectations is, however, supported by the evidence. While the relative units of length were the anatomical ones of the Greek, Hellenistic and Roman systems, the absolute lengths are as unclear as those of ancient Greece. Any assessment has to consider the three foot lengths of 31.02, 29.6 and 30.8 centimetres.

31.2 centimetres: This is the length most often proposed as the standard one of the eastern Empire, yet it is derived solely from analyses of buildings. In addition, the analyses themselves are debatable, as with that of the Church of the Acheiropoietos in Salonica, of the late fifth century. According to Schilbach, the church has an overall interior width of 28.33 metres, a nave of 14.03 metres, and aisles each of 6.25 metres, which he takes to be, respectively, 90 feet averaging 31.5 centimetres, 45 such feet of 31.1 centimetres, and 20 feet of 31.25 centimetres. These three values are close enough to appear convincing, yet the figures are misleading, as Schilbach has omitted the thickness of the arcade walls from his calculations, invalidating his argument. According to Schilbach's lengths, the walls must be 2 ½ feet thick (90 feet minus 85 feet (45 + 20 + 20) = 5, = 2 ½ feet each), and as they are 90 centimetres thick (28.33 metres minus 26.25 metres (6.25 + 14.03 + 6.25 metres) = 1.8 metres, = 90 centimetres each), the feet must be 36 centimetres long (90 divided by 2.5 = 36). Thus either the thickness of the arcade wall was determined using an entirely different foot, which is difficult if not impossible to accept, or Schilbach is wrong in proposing a foot of 31.2 centimetres.[13]

[11] Hyginus, "De agrorum conditionibus", in *Corpus agrimensorum romanorum*, ed. Carolus Thulin, Leipzig, 1913, p. 74-86.

[12] For Hero see e.g. *MSR*, vol. 1, p. 180-192. It has been reasonably pointed out that "Italian" need not mean "Roman". For a discussion see Fernie, "Historical Metrology", p. 395, n. 9.

[13] Erich Schilbach, *Byzantinische Metrologie*, Munich, 1970, p. 14-15.

Justinian's Hagia Sophia is also usually assumed to have been laid out with this foot, from the fact that its dome has a diameter of 31.09 centimetres, taken as 100 such feet.[14] As with the analysis of the Acheiropoietos church the assumption is that feet will be used in round numbers. This assumption has been called into question by Peter Kidson, who points out that the diameter of 31.09 metres represents 105 Roman feet of 29.6 centimetres. On its own the figure of 105 is less convincing that 100, but Kidson observes that the pendentives of Hagia Sophia form part of a notional dome with the same diameter as the dome of the Pantheon. This has a diameter of 43.6 metres or 147 Roman feet, such an odd figure that a round number, 150, has been assumed by some scholars. Yet the diameter of 43.6 metres divided by 150 produces a foot of only 29.06 centimetres, unlikely in a building of prime imperial importance in the centre of Rome itself, and in which the standard foot of 29.6 centimetres is otherwise prominent (in the paving slabs, for example). 147 feet is in any case not such an odd length when it is taken with the 21 foot thickness of the walls, making it seven units of 21, while the 105 Roman feet in the dome of Hagia Sophia constitute five such units.[15]

30.8 centimetres: A carved stone slab in the South Kensington Science Museum (1944-28), dated to the sixth century on the basis of the forms of the letters and the title of the official, bears the following inscription:

> "Flaveus Aeneas the Silentiary, to landowners, tenants and farmers: know that the most sublime and righteous Lord of the whole inhabited world has decreed that no-one is permitted to sow or trespass on the land within fifteen feet on each side of the aqueduct, according to the sublime commands. But if anyone attempts to do this, he is liable to the capital penalty and confiscation of his property. This foot measure is appended to this notice".[16]

The measure in question is 30.89 centimetres long. This is the length known from the Salamis slab and from a documentary reference as existing in North Africa in the early second century AD.

There is, then, a case for the use of the Roman foot of 29.6 centimetres in Hagia Sophia in the sixth century, implying it is likely to have been used elsewhere, and attested evidence for the old Greek measure of 30.8 centimetres being used in the emperor's name in the same century. What is odd is the

[14] Paul Underwood, "Some Principles of Measure in the Architecture of the Period of Justinian", in *Cahiers archéologiques*, 3, 1948, p. 72.

[15] Peter Kidson, personal comment. For the 150-foot proposal see, for example, Paul Davies, David Hemsoll, & Mark Wilson-Jones, "The Pantheon: Triumph of Rome or Triumph of Compromise?", in *Art History*, 10, 1987, p. 133-153. For other proposed examples of the 31.1 centimetre foot length see Underwood, "Principles", p. 67-73. Doron Chen, "Dating the Cardo Maximus in Jerusalem", in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 114, 1982, p. 43-45, proposes a Byzantine foot of 32 centimetres.

[16] Science Museum, item 1944-28, catalogue card; Félix-Marie Abel, "Inscription grecque de l'aqueduc de Jérusalem avec la figure du pied byzantin", in *Revue Biblique*, 35, 1926, p. 283-288. There is also evidence for the use of this foot in the sixth-century Basilica A at Philippi. The overall internal width is 30.84 metres or 100 such feet, the nave is 15.4 metres or 50 feet, the aisles 6.49 metres or 21 feet, and the arcade walls are 1.23 metres or 4 feet (Underwood, "Principles", p. 71). The inscription runs as follows:
+ ΦΛSAINIACCIΛENTIA [---]
OCKTHTOPCINEΓΛHM [--]
TOPCINKAIΓEΩPΓOICΓINΩ [-]
KETEΩCOΘIOTATOCKAIEYCE
BSΔECΠOTHCOΛHCOIKOYME
NHCEΘECΠICENMHEZEINA
ITINEIAΠOIEΠ°EZEKATEP
OYMEPOYCTOYYΔPAΓΩΓIO
YKATATACΘIACΔIATAZIC
EΠITAECΩMEPHCΠIPINH
ΦOITEYEINEIΔETICTOYTO
EΠIXIPHCHΠOIHCAIKEΦA
ΛIKHNYΠOMENITIMΩPI
ANKAITOKTHMAAYTO
YΔHMEYETETOΔEMETRO
NTOYΠOΔOCYΠOTETAK
TAITOYTOICTOICTYΠOIC +

[17] Introductory literature on Armenian metrology, such as the articles of Manadian and von Mžik, is mentioned in Eric Fernie, "Pegolotti's Cloth Lengths", *Studies of Medieval Art, Liturgy and Metrology Presented to Christopher Hohler*, ed. Alan Borg & Andrew Martindale, (B.A.R. International Series, 111), Oxford, 1981, p. 13-28, p. 19 and n. 35-37.

absence of any sign of the Ptolemaic-Philetaireian system, despite its being widely used in the Near Eastern lands of both the Hellenistic and Roman empires, despite its associations with Hero and with Alexandria, one of the most important scientific centres of the time, and despite the fact that it appears to lie behind other late antique systems of measurement, such as those of the Armenians.[17]

***

In the belief or at least the hope that questions can be as useful as answers, the paper concludes with two.

1. Why was the long, seven-palm Egyptian cubit turned, in the Hellenistic period, into a new, six-palm standard cubit?

2. Why are the lengths of the Hellenistic empire, which were used in the area in the Roman period, apparently absent from the systems of the eastern Roman Empire?

Abbot Anslem's Gate Tower at Bury St Edmunds*

Peter Fergusson

Bury St Edmunds' *Gesta Sacristarum* (London, British Library, MS Harley 1005) written circa 1300 lauded the skills of the abbey's sacrists for their management of building operations. It also lists the abbots under whom they worked and who had an interest in architecture. Of the twelfth-century abbots three are singled out. Best known is Samson (1182 – 1211), immortalized in Jocelin of Brakelond's *Chronicle*, who completed the west tower of the abbey church, re-roofed a number of its chapels, and constructed the *pulpitum* and rood screens.[1] Least known is Abbot Robert II (1102 – 1107) whose short rule nonetheless gave him time to expand the new church westwards, erect the claustral buildings, infirmary, and abbot's *camera*.[2] The most remarkable, at least for architecture, is Abbot Anselm (1121 – 1148). He finished the nave of the abbey church, constructed the huge west facade, built two parish churches, raised three bell towers, strengthened the city and monastery with gatehouses, and shaped new precinct and urban spaces. He was also the patron of artists and sculptors, and a committed bibliophile.[3] Of all his undertakings the sole survivor is the Gate Tower to the monastery (Fig. 1), which is the focus of this paper along with the forecourt it fronted and defined.

Few books devoted to Norman architecture in England omit illustration of the Gate Tower. Despite its fame, the Tower has attracted little scholarly attention.[4] Not helping matters are the different names by which it is known. In the twelfth century, documents refer to the Tower as "Church Gate" and *Porta cimiterii*. Nearly two hundred years later, the *Gesta* calls it the "St James Tower", the name deriving form its service to the adjacent parish church of St James. The shift away from association with the great church is puzzling. The name stuck surviving the Suppression and continuing to the present. In 2005 St James became St Edmundsbury Cathedral (as a millennium project), leaving the St James Tower as the sole connection to the building's parochial origins.

Before turning to Abbot Anselm, Bury's earlier architectural history needs brief mention. The town and monastery derived from the guardianship of the shrine of St Edmund, Saxon king and martyr (died 869/70). Monarchs provided royal patronage and privileges, their interest garnering plentiful resources of land and income for the abbey and making it one of the richest in England. Among the kings, Edward the Confessor was a particularly fervent votary. To promote reform he appointed in 1065 a French monk from St Denis, Baldwin, as abbot (1065 – 1097). His early years of rule were spent countering the efforts of Bishop Herfast to co-opt Bury as the episcopal see (eventually settled at Norwich). The struggle took Baldwin to Rome to plead his case. It was only in 1081 with victory behind him that Baldwin embarked on Bury's urban and monastic expansion. For the town he set out streets on grid principles, among them the lengthy west to east Church Gate Street which was lined up on

* For Paul, with respect and affection. In the preparation of the paper I wish to thank warmly: Stuart Harrison, Charles McClendon, Kristin Mortimer, Deborah Kahn, Malcolm Thurlby, David Robinson, Neil Stratford, Christopher Wilson, and Caroline Bruzelius.

1 *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, transl. Harold Edgeworth Butler, Oxford, 1949, p. 96; also Montague Rhodes James, *On the Abbey of S. Edmund at Bury, I: The Library, II: The Church* (Publications of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 7), Cambridge, 1895, p. 153 -155. See also, Antonia Gransden, *A History of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds 1182 – 1256*, Woodbridge, 2007, p. 83 -92.

2 James, *Abbey of S. Edmund,* p. 118, 153.

3 *Ibidem*, p. 118-119, 153.

4 The standard treatment is Arthur Bensley Whittingham, *Bury St Edmunds Abbey*, London, 1971. For the Gate Tower see p. 24.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100128

Fig. 1. Bury St Edmund’s, Gate Tower, west façade (Stuart Harrison)

Fig. 2. Bury St Edmunds, Monastery plan (after A.B. Whittingham, *Bury St Edmunds Abbey*, London, English Heritage, 2006)

axis with the new church (Fig. 2).[5] For the monastery, Baldwin enlarged the precinct, began the church, and laid out the conventual buildings to the north. The church was modeled on contemporary pilgrimage churches. By 1095 construction of the crypt, ambulatory and radiating chapels, and wide transepts was complete and the body of St Edmund was transferred from the adjacent smaller Saxon church. Another thirty years were needed to complete the nave, aisles, and west end at which time Bury was the third largest church in Europe; only Cluny in Burgundy and Winchester Cathedral were bigger.

In 1121 Anselm was elected abbot to begin a twenty-seven-year rule. Italian born, his mother was the sister of St Anselm of Canterbury. At the time of his election, explained in part by his closeness to the papal court, Anselm was Abbot of S. Saba in Rome, a Benedictine foundation which lies on a

[5] Bernard GAUTHIEZ, "The Planning of the Town of Bury St. Edmunds: A Probable Norman Origin", in *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture, Archaeology, and Economy* (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 20), ed. Antonia GRANSDEN, London, 1998 (hereafter cited as *BAACT: Bury*), p. 80 -97

spur of the Aventine hill between the Baths of Caracalla and the Ostian Gate. [6] His early life left him with a love of Rome, affirmed by his habit of styling himself in charters "son of the church of Rome". When he arrived at St Edmunds, the new abbot found the western parts of the church unfinished and the area it fronted undeveloped. His major undertaking was the church facade.[7] He adopted a design of unprecedented form and scale, which Philip McAleer calls the most complex facade structure ever built in Britain or the Continent.[8] It comprised a huge screen facade stretching an unprecedented 80 metres (246 feet) north to south. A five part massing scheme was adopted: a central axial crossing tower, flanking double-storey chapel blocks, and polygonal structures at the terminals. Not all features of this ambitious undertaking are understood. Anglo-Saxon tradition may explain the axial tower; it was appropriate to Edmund's heritage, and decidedly un-Norman.[9] Less clear are the source and purpose of the double storey chapels and polygonal terminals.

Anselm's patronage extended widely. The *Gesta* credits him with the construction of a *clocarium*, or belfry, which he furnished with a peal of bells, a separate project from the St James Tower.[10] Inside the monastic church, he had the north ambulatory chapel re-dedicated to S. Saba (the mother of Gregory the Great) and painted with frescoes, presumably a cycle celebrating her life, like those from the eighth century at S. Saba.[11] For the church's principal west entry he commissioned doors made of *arte fusoria*, cast or bronze work, from Magister Hugo.[12] In front of the church, Anselm constructed what the *Gesta* calls "an atrium closed with a wall".[13]

Outside the precinct, Anselm persuaded the king to grant him in 1125 the right to hold the popular St James market fair in a space extending from Church Gate in the south to Angel Hill (about 150 metres to the north). This commercial monopoly tapped the custom of pilgrims to St Edmund's shrine thereby ensuring the abbey an added stream of income. These features – church facade, atrium, Gate Tower, re-located parish church (see below), and market space – need to be seen not in isolation but as part of an integrated programme of urban and precinct planning with few rivals in England.

The adoption of an atrium is particularly interesting.[14] Although no trace survives, some details can be established. The north and west dimensions – 80 metres by 52.26 metres – were fixed by the facade of the pilgrimage church, and the flank of St James' where the twelfth-century footings underpin the present Perpendicular building.[15] A porch from St James' faced south into the atrium and doubled as the Lady Chapel. The west side of the atrium was dominated by the Gate Tower which was aligned on the main portal of the church. In the present it is free-standing but this is the consequence of modern restoration begun by L. N. Cottingham in 1843. The Tower was originally closed by walls on the lateral sides the tops of which provided access to the bell ringers' chamber, as may still be seen (Fig. 1).[16] The south

[6] Ralph Henry Carless Davis, "The Monks of Bury St Emunds 1021 – 1148", in *History*, 40, 1955, p. 227-239. For S. Saba, see Carlo La Bella, *San Saba*, Rome, 2003.

[7] The *Gesta Sacristarum* credits the work to Anslem's sacrists, Ralph and Hervey; see James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, p. 153. But the scale of the design and the choice of the facade's forms would have been made by the abbot as patron.

[8] See J. Philip McAleer, "The West Front of the Abbey Church", in *BAACT: Bury*, p. 22 -33; J. Philip McAleer, "Le problème du transept occidental en Grande-Bretagne", in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 34, 1991 p. 349 - 356.

[9] McAleer, "The West Front", p. 28 -29.

[10] James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, p. 144.

[11] James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, p. 180. The chapel was used throughout the Middle Ages for the instruction of novices, an appropriate purpose given her role in the up-bringing of Pope Gregory.

[12] James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, p. 128, and supplemented by McAleer, "The West Front", note 6. Hugo was also a bell founder, and skilled as a manuscript illuminator.

[13] … *qui murorum ambitum circa atrium ecclesiae fecerunt*…; see James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, p. 153.

[14] At Lincoln, *atrium* was used for the cemetery on the northwest side of the late eleventh-century cathedral; see David Stocker & Paul Everson, *Summoning St Michael: Early Romanesque Towers in Lincolnshire*, Oxford, 2006, p. 88.

[15] St James was built by Baldwin but when Abbot Robert II expanded the Great Church, St James was too close to it leading Anselm to move it to the present site.

[16] Evidence of flanking structures comes from patched-in sockets for wall joists. I owe these observations to Mr Stuart Harrison whose Fig. 1 is also gratefully acknowledged.

side of the atrium is now open to the Great Cemetery, but must have been closed originally by Anselm's wall, as the *Gesta* tells us. Functions generic to atriums may be assumed for the space between the Gate Tower and the church. Such spaces were flanked by a quadriporticus for communication and also in cases like Bury to serve in some degree to regularize it.[17] A clue that a quadriporticus existed at Bury comes from the Buck brothers' panorama of the city which was engraved in 1741 and which shows ruins of an enclosure to the east of the tower with wall returns with blind arcades on both the southwest and northwest angles.

A second common feature of atriums related to burial in the open space as well as in the galleried walks. The atrium and the adjacent Great Cemetery explain the Gate Tower's other twelfth-century name, *porta cimiterii*. The cemetery served the town and on its east side (in a separate enclosure) the monastic community (Fig. 2). Brakelond's *Chronicle* refers to free-standing buildings within the cemetery such as the Chapel of St Andrew, although he says others were used for drinking, and others again for "…things of which it is best to say nothing".[18] These distinct spaces are implied in a further reference when St Edmund complains in a dream to an un-named person that "…his cemetery and the porches of his church were negligently guarded".[19]

The Gate Tower formed part of the western side of the atrium and played an important role in its functions. For those relating to burial, the Tower served for the tolling of the passing bell, a monastic practice detailed at Christ Church Canterbury in Lanfranc's *Constitutions* (circa 1077).[20] At Bury this occurred while the mourners gathered around the bier in the Tower's generous ground story while awaiting the arrival of clergy prior to moving to the grave site.[21] A second function was judicial. The Gate Tower was the locus of the Sacrists' Court, one of several courts providing jurisdiction at the monastery which enjoyed the privilege of being a Liberty (an independent jurisdiction). An episode in Brakelond's *Chronicle* alludes to this. A rich Bury moneylender, Hamo Blunt, drew Samson's ire for excluding his relatives and the poor from his will. Ordering a different division, the abbot ordained just distribution as a condition of burial in the cemetery, saying "… as for [Blunt's] horse, which was led before the bier of the dead man and offered to St Edmund, I order that it should be sent back and restored [to the estate]" (*Chronicle*, p. 58). Since the gift was for the altar it came within the jurisdiction of the sacrist (pre-empted in this instance by Samson as abbot). The setting where horse and bier were brought together was the Gate Tower.[22]

A third function centered on the Gate Tower's role in monumentalizing the inward progress of pilgrims and visitors of rank to the abbey. Approaching the complex along Abbot Baldwin's Church Gate Street, they would pause before the Gate Tower's high portal, on axis with the Great Church's central single tower and then move through the atrium to the main doorway ennobled by Master Hugo's bronze doors. The Gate Tower's facade served, in other words, as a stage set or backdrop, a feature underscored by the lavish architectural ornament on its west, or town, side. Reception ceremo-

[17] Fig. 2 shows that the Gate Tower's alignment with Church Gate Street and the centre doorway of the façade, meant an off-center position on the atrium's west side. A surrounding porticus would have mitigated this asymmetry. For a general context see Francesco Gandolfo, "La façade romane et ses rapports avec le protiro, l'atrium, et le quadriportico", in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 34, 1991, p. 309 -319; Jean Pierre Caillet, "Atrium, peristyle et cloître: des réalitiés si diverses?", in *Der mittelalterliche Kreuzgang: Architektur, Funktion und Programm*, ed. Peter K. Klein, Regensburg, 2004, p. 57-65.

[18] *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond* , p. 31.

[19] *Ibidem*, p. 110.

[20] David Knowles & Richard Southern, *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, Oxford, 2002, p. 189 -193.

[21] For the relation of towers to the burial liturgy, see Stocker & Everson, *Summoning St Michael*, p. 79 -91. See also, Damien Sicard, *La liturgie de la mort dans l'église latine des origines à la réforme carolingienne* (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen, 63), Münster, 1978. I am particularly grateful to David Stocker and Paul Everson for discussing their work with me.

[22] A parallel case of the Sacrist's Court being located under the campanile is Christ Church, Canterbury, see Reginald Anthony Lendon Smith, *Canterbury Cathedral Priory: A Study of Monastic Administration,* Cambridge, 1943, p. 68-82, 92-93.

Fig.3a. Bury St Edmunds, Gate Tower, west entry inner order, north side, capital (Courtauld Institute of Art)

Fig. 3b. Bury St Edmunds, Gate Tower, west entry inner order, south side, capital (Courtauld Institute of Art)

nial utilized the wall passage above the portal's pediment to provide for singers and musicians. Brakelond describes just such a formal entry when Samson returned to Bury after his election as abbot in 1182. The occasion was orchestrated to coincide with Palm Sunday. Brakelond relates how the monks met Samson "with solemnity … *ad portam cimiterii*", the occasion marked by the ringing of bells "… both within the church and without". The new abbot "… came surrounded with a multitude of people and dismounted from his horse on the threshold of the Gate, and having caused his shoes to be taken off, was received barefoot within the door, the Prior and Sacrist conducting him on either hand. We in our part sang the responses *Benedictus Dominus* from the office for Trinity, and *Martiri adhuc* from the office of the feast of St Edmund".[23] Following this ceremony, Samson was conducted through the atrium to the church.

These over-lapping purposes are reflected in the architecture of the Gate Tower. Its principal or west side is defined by a concentration of architectural detail around the great portal (see Fig. 1) which was crowned by a projecting pediment and flanked by pyramid-roofed pylons. Missing elements of the doorway include a carved tympanum showing a Majestas Domini supported by two angels. This was removed in 1788 to provide "a freer access for loads of hay and straw", an operation accomplished by chiseling away the supporting abacus (see the repair in Fig. 3 b).[24] The entry itself is framed by four arch-orders, the inner three with stout roll mouldings supported on plain block capitals, the outer decorated with chevron which trails down into the framing jambs. Individual details – block capitals, steeply chamfered bases, and chevron, billet– compare with those at Norwich Cathedral, Norwich Castle, Castle Rising, all dating from the early 1100s.[25]

Flanking the entry portal are eighteen foot high pylons with niches and pyramid roofs resting on corbelled heads which signify burial tradition. These unusual features have not been traced. They resemble aedicules and specifically recall Roman aedicular tombs.[26] Their placement on the Gate Tower underlines its functions relating to burial as well as alluding to the burial place of St Edmund. The same theme is struck by the carved capitals supported by triple shafts on the intrados of the entry arch. On the north, a figure seated side-saddle on the back of a double-headed winged griffin (Fig. 3 a) resembles Alexander's Celestial Journey, and on the south a lion holds in its jaws the head of a prostrate figure and is flanked on the sides by smaller rampant lions (Fig. 3 b).

The tower's three upper stages are framed by plain clasp buttresses and ruled off into distinctive panels by string courses with different ornament: chevron, corbel, and plain. Each stage uses a distinctive composition, although common to each is the enclosure of a smaller motif by a larger one, giving the effect of surmounting and surmounted forms (like Norwich Cathedral north transept exterior and St Nicolas at Caen). Above the entry passage, the first stage housed the unusually well-lighted bell-ringers' chamber generously accessed from the wall tops through side doors and a center doorway from the exterior wall passage. Two blind arches frame biforia openings, the tympana carved with an unusual pleated motif, and the surmounting archivolts strapped together by beaker-clasps, and topped by a hood moulding. For the upper two stages of the Tower, triforia openings replaced the biforias.

23 *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, p. 24.

24 James says a Majestas with the four Evangelist symbols, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, p. 127. A drawing in the Society of Antiquaries of London from circa 1755 from the Lylleton Bequest, Minute Book, XI, 7, fol. 24 shows supporting angels only. The side niches depicted horned devils propelling forward an inward-facing male figure clutching a money bag with flames at his feet and snakes at his legs. They survive in the Moyse Hall Museum in Bury whence they were removed by Cottingham in the 1840s.

25 For Norwich Cathedral, see Eric Fernie, *Architectural History of Norwich Cathedral*, Oxford, 1993, p. 63, figs. 15, 17; for Norwich Castle and particularly Bigod's Tower, see T. A. Heslop, *Norwich Castle Keep*, Norwich, 1994, p. 29-32; for Castle Rising, see Reginald Allen Brown, *Castle Rising Castle*, London, 1992, p. 41, 47. I gratefully acknowledge the help of Professor Malcolm Thurlby with the comparative examples.

26 See John Summerson, *Heavenly Mansions*, New York, 1950, p. 1 -28; Pierre Gros, *L'architecture romaine: du début du IIIe siècle avant J.-C. à la fin du Haut-Empire*, vol. 2, Paris, 2001, p. 399-422.

The lower of these, the tallest of the tower, has tall blind arches decorated with billet which enclose single light windows with blind biforia below, chevron decorated. The upper has three arches surmounting single windows, with blind sunk roundels below (recalling those in the crossing of Norwich Cathedral). At the tower's summit, Cottingham replaced the original battlements with a straight parapet, and, with greater liberty still, provided the projecting waterspouts with beakhead brackets reflecting his earlier restoration at Kilpeck (Herefordshire). Neither appears in the Buck brothers' engraving of 1741 which also shows the tower surmounted by a low spire.

With these observations it is possible to consider Anselm's work in a wider context. On arriving at Bury fresh from Rome as an ambitious, cosmopolitan, well-connected, and artistically sophisticated churchman, one knows that he found his new life less than consoling.[27] His predecessors had left him a huge, half-completed church whose scale and dimensions related to other monumental pilgrimage churches such as Winchester, Durham, Norwich, Ely, and London Old St Paul's. Like Bury these had all been begun between 1079 and the early 1090s but were also incomplete.[28] Explaining the dimensions of these six buildings, as recent scholarship has shown, was Old St Peter's in Rome, the prototype whose influence has been traced in the use of near identical measurements (Fig. 4).

In finishing the work at St Edmunds, Anselm accomplished something no other English patron had tried. To complete the west parts of the church and its related areas, he broadened and strengthened the linkage with Old St Peter's

Fig. 4. Bury St Edmunds, Monastic Church, plan superimposed over the plan of Old St Peter's, Rome (from Eric Fernie, *Norwich Cathedral*, Oxford, 1993, Fig. 51)

[27] See Davis, "The Monks of Bury St Edmunds", p. 236- 39.

[28] For Winchester, see Richard Gem, "The Romanesque Cathedral of Winchester: Patron and Design in the Eleventh Century", in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral* (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 3), ed. Nicola Coldstream, London, 1983, p. 1 - 12; for Durham, see Malcolm Thurlby, "The Roles of the Patron and the Master Mason in the First Design of the Romanesque Cathedral of Durham", in *Anglo-Norman Durham 1093 – 1193*, ed. David Rollason et al., Woodbridge, 1994, p. 161-184; for Norwich, see Fernie, *Norwich Cathedral*, p. 136-140; for Old St. Paul's, see Richard Gem, "The Romanesque Architecture of Old St. Paul's Cathedral and its Late Eleventh-Century Context", in *Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology in London* (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 10) ed. Lindy Grant, London, 1990, p. 47-63.

by adopting distinctive features such as the atrium, bronze entry doors, and Gate Tower.[29] A further connection may be suggested. The huge west facade constituted a western transept with double storey chapels and polygonal terminations and has long puzzled scholars. McAleer has suggested a baptistery for the south terminal and a mausoleum for the north, and put forward as the likely source the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.[30] But Rome also needs to be considered. At Old St Peter's the western placement of broad transepts show galleries in the transept ends, an Imperial circular mausoleum on the south (Fig. 5), and a baptistery on the north. Could Anselm have transferred these elements keeping their western orientation consistent?

Fig. 5 Marten Van Heemskerck, Old St Peter's, Rome, drawing, the course of demolition showing the bell tower of S. Maria in Turri, atrium, nave, and transept mausoleum (Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett)

More Roman still was the Gate Tower. By the early 1100s towers had become popular additions to major churches in Rome.[31] They appear as part of the atrium at the Papal basilica at the Lateran, at S. Paolo fuori le Mura, and at Old St Peter's where the earlier tower dedicated to S. Maria in Turri was renewed.[32] At the last, the tower stood adjacent to the main entry portal complete with its own chapel; it served the *parvie* within the atrium and other burial areas; and it played a role in the reception of dignitaries (Fig. 5). Next to the tower was the tomb of Pope Gregory the Great, the son of S. Saba for whom Anselm retained a special devotion.

To make these linkages of Bury to Old St Peter's meaningful to Anselm's East Anglian community involved a process of association and recall. The Apostolic prototype was apprehended through types rather than through appearances. Nothing about the Gate Tower or the west facade (of which it was a component part) looked Roman. In choosing typology as the vehicle of connection-making, Anslem may have seen it as more comprehensible to his monks than appearance. His challenge was to devise a western complex calculated to provide the Great Church and its royal saint with a connective context of memory and memorial. To accomplish this he assembled elements consciously celebrating Bury's lineage and local traditions and combined them with wide international references focused on Rome.[33]

[29] North Italian churches in the early 1100 also utilized atriums, see the early chapters in Christian Sapin, *Avant-nefs et espaces d'accueil dans l'église entre le IVe et le XIIe siècle*, Paris, 2002. Bronze entry doors are rare in England. At Old St Peter's, they date from the eighth century, and at St Paul's Outside the Walls, from the late eleventh century; see Sible De Blaauw, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale*, Rome, 1994, p. 724 and note 282; and Richard Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianorum Romae*, 5 vols., Rome, 1937-1970, vol. 5, p. 101.

[30] McAleer, "The West Front", p. 29.

[31] Sible De Blaauw, "Campanae supra urbem: Sull'uso delle campane nella Roma medievale", in *Revista di storia delle chiesa in Italia*, 47, 1993, p. 367- 414. The closest example to Bury of a Gate Tower preceding a quadriporticus in Rome is SS Quattro Coronati, see Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum*, vol. 4, p. 15 -17.

[32] Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum*, vol. 5, p. 106 - 108; 269 -271.

[33] A parallel of this same process of assembly would be Durham Cathedral, begun shortly after Bury; see Jean Bony, "Le projet premier de Durham: voûtement partiel ou voûtement total?", in *Urbanisme et architecture, études, écrites et publiées en l'honneur de Pierre Lavedan*, Paris, 1954, p. 41-49

Displacements at Medieval Salisbury, Old Sarum, and Wilton

Virginia Jansen

From a windswept hill, the archaeological site of Old Sarum overlooks the attractive cathedral town of Salisbury lying in the meadows below at the junction of the Avon and Nadder rivers (Fig. 1). Three miles to the west at the confluence of the Nadder with the Wylye, the village of Wilton is now best known for Wilton House, home to the earls of Pembroke. Buried under and within the house and grounds lie the remains of the royal nunnery of Wilton Abbey.

The present circumstances differ considerably from the ancient and medieval past. Wilton, a royal borough since late Anglo-Saxon times, had been the royal seat of the kingdom of Wessex and the county town. On the site of Old Sarum, an Iron Age hill fort once stood sentinel over prehistoric tracks. After 1066, the Normans made Old Sarum, then called Salisbury, a key stronghold with a castle and cathedral. Below Old Sarum, no urban centre existed before the thirteenth century; instead, the lowlands sometimes identified as the "Old Salisburies" formed sparsely populated lands of the bishop's manor.[1] How did it happen that a new Salisbury rose here to displace both the important borough of Wilton and the military and administrative centre of Old Sarum?[2]

Although the word "displacement" has common usage in the modern period, displacements occurred frequently in the later Middle Ages. As new orders of society and governments expelled older entities, hegemonic displacements unsettled many domains – political, institutional, economic, social, ethnic, and cultural, including architectural. Beginning with the very name Salisbury, which the new town acquired at the expense of the castle-town, this investigation of three towns describes not only a process of displacement, but also disruption in the paradigm of a harmonious Christian society, an ideal by now nearly deflated. Positing an ideal skews, or displaces, historical understanding because, seen from only one subject position, it obscures factors behind events by identifying only a few. In attempting to explore the historical geography of Salisbury, analogous to probing "*post festum* afterthoughts", I acknowledge two articles by Paul Crossley, both written with his characteristic "soufflé-like" energy and nuanced historical inquiry: the oft-cited "The Limits of Iconography" and the marvellously dispersed yet connected tissues of "The Architecture of Queenship".[3]

The intersection of the fates of the three towns converges on the transfer of Salisbury Cathedral to a site more appropriate to late twelfth-century clerical ideals. In its seductively serene beauty, Salisbury Cathedral in its precinct has long signified a glorious Middle Ages to pilgrims, tourists, artists,

[1] Although anachronistic, I shall refer to the new city as New Salisbury or simply Salisbury and to the fortress as Old Sarum. For the names and their designations see Francis Hill, "The Borough of Old Salisbury", in *Victoria History of the Counties of England, Wiltshire* (hereafter *VCH Wilts.*), ed. Ralph B. Pugh & Elizabeth Crittall, vol. 6, ed. Elizabeth Crittall, London, 1962, p. 51-52, and Ralph B. Pugh, "The Word 'Sarum'", in *ibidem*, p. 93-94.

[2] Because many authors have written on Salisbury, the later ones utilizing the work of the earlier, I shall generally cite only the most pertinent, but all have facilitated my research: Robert Benson & Henry Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum, or Salisbury* (vol. 6 of Richard Colt Hoare, *History of Modern Wiltshire*), London, 1843; Fanny Street, "The Relations of the Bishops and Citizens of Salisbury (New Sarum) between 1225 and 1612", in *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, 39, 1916, p. 185-257 and 319-367; Marian K. Dale et al., "New Salisbury", in *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 69-93; Kenneth H. Rogers, "Salisbury", ed. Mary D. Lobel, *Historic Towns: Maps and Plans of Towns and Cities in the British Isles, with Historical Commentaries, from Earliest Times to 1800*, vol. 1, Baltimore, 1969, p. 1-9 (each town paginated separately); Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *Ancient and Historical Monuments in the City of Salisbury*, vol. 1, London, 1980.

[3] The quotation of *post festum* occurs on page 116 of "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: The Limits of Iconography", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 130, 1988, p. 116-121; "The Architecture of Queenship: Royal Saints, Female Dynasties and the Spread of Gothic Architecture in Central Europe", in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan, Woodbridge, 1997, p. 263-300.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100129

Fig. 1. The area around Salisbury (after Richard Colt Hoare, "A Map of Antiquities in the district of South Wiltshire", *The Ancient History of Wiltshire*, vol. 2, London, 1819, facing p. 105, and British Geological Survey, England and Wales Sheet 298: *Salisbury*, *Bedrock and Superficial Deposits*, 1:50 000, Keyworth, Nottingham, 2005; re-worked by Virginia Jansen with graphics by Corri Jimenez)

Fig. 2. Salisbury Cathedral across meadows from the west (photo Virginia Jansen)

and art historians (Fig. 2). Yet its translation to the valley produced "a field of tension" in devastating the prevailing boroughs of Old Sarum and Wilton.[4]

In an era of hierarchical social order, when cathedrals almost always dominated their urban areas, the canons saw only disadvantages at Old Sarum.[5] Even though they inflated their troubles to sell the move to the king and pope, the authorizing papal bull of 1218 laid out obvious problems. The wind howled, brought cold, and ripped off roofs; space was cramped; clergy, worshippers, and merchants were subject to the whims of military control; water on the hill was expensive.[6] William of Malmesbury had already remarked that Old Sarum was "a fortress playing the role of a city".[7]

[4] Quotation from Theodor Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections from a Damaged Life*, trans. Edmund F. N. Jephcott, London, 1974, p. 127, as cited in Caren Kaplan, *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*, Durham, 1996, p. 101.

[5] Recent contributions to this topic are many, but Wolfgang Braunfels had considered it in 1976: *Abendländische Stadtbaukunst: Herrschaftsform und Baugestalt*, Cologne, 1976; see especially p. 38 of the American edition: *Urban Design in Western Europe: Regime and Architecture, 900-1900*, trans. Kenneth J. Northcott, Chicago, 1988.

[6] *Vetus Registrum Sarisberiense alias dictum registrum S. Osmundi episcopi [The Register of St. Osmund]*, ed. William H. Rich Jones (Rolls Series, 78), vol. 2, London, 1884, p. 5-7; Kathleen Edwards, "Cathedral of Salisbury", in *VCH Wilts.*, vol. 3, ed. Ralph B. Pugh & Elizabeth Crittall, London, 1956, p. 164-165. Wind forces were not exaggerated: five days after the cathedral consecration in 1092, the tower roof was ruined; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 60.

[7] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum: The History of the English Bishops*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. Michael Winterbottom, Oxford, 2007, p. 289.

The new site, on lands of the bishop's manor near one of his mills, remedied these deficiencies.[8] The location was encircled on two sides by the waters of the Avon and Nadder. A river terrace bordering the alluvium plains provided a large, flat building site for both the cathedral, placed as far to the terrace edge as possible, and the town, which grew up between the mill and a hill to the east (Figs 3 and 4).[9]

Even though Bishop Richard Poore's charter to the town dates from at least five years after the relocation, the town was certainly planned from the start.[10] Not only does the ideal regularity of the Close and urban grid layout connote planning, but also the decades around 1200 saw vigorous urban plantation.[11] Renowned are the *bastides* of southwestern France established later than Salisbury. In southern England the bishop of Winchester founded the new towns of Alresford (Hants.) in 1200, Downton (Wilts.; Fig. 1) in circa 1208, Overton (Hants.) in 1217-1218, Newton at Burghclere (Hants.) in 1218, and Hindon (Wilts.) in 1219-1220.[12] Previously, Bishop Roger of Salisbury had founded Devizes between 1135 and 1139, and Bishop Poore himself founded Sherborne Newland (Dorset) in 1227-1228.[13]

Understanding the "politics of placement", the canons undoubtedly recognized the opportunities for revenue that would accrue from a new town owing lordship as well as supplying high-end commodities.[14] They already had acquired commercial experience at Old Sarum from the market tolls and customs belonging to the cathedral there.[15] Hence, at the crossroads of pre-existing routes and adjacent to the bishop's mill, a large market square was platted, similar to other planned towns such as the *bastides* Monpazier and Beaumont du Périgord as well as some Roman towns. The parish church was situated along one axis. Tenement plots were based on a standard size of seven by three perches (about 115 x 50 feet, or 35.05 x 15.24 metres) with an annual ground-rent of twelve pence.[16]

Here was abundant water, not the costly liquid of Old Sarum's "many welles of swete water".[17] To prevent flooding in the valley of five rivers, water was managed.[18] Water channels feeding from the

[8] Undoubtedly a factor in site selection, the bishop owned four-and-a-half mills in the valley; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 51.

[9] Rogers, "Salisbury", p. 2; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 69; British Geological Survey, England and Wales Sheet 298: *Salisbury*, *Bedrock and Superficial Deposits*, 1:50 000, Keyworth, Nottingham, 2005. I thank Tim Tatton-Brown for the latter reference. The map shows the southwest corner of the cloister situated at the edge of the gravel terrace.

[10] Rogers, "Salisbury", p. 3-4; David W. Lloyd, "Historical Introduction", in *Salisbury: A New Approach to the City and Its Neighbourhood*, ed. Hugh Shortt, London, 1972, p. 14; compare Maurice Beresford on Farnham in "Six New Towns of the Bishops of Winchester", in *Medieval Archaeology*, 3, 1959, p. 189.

[11] Maurice Beresford, *New Towns of the Middle Ages: Town Plantation in England, Wales, and Gascony*, New York, 1967, p. 328-336 and Appendix I, p. 637-641, also p. 75-77 and 151. For Salisbury, see RCHM(E), *Salisbury*, p. xxxii-xxxiv, and p. xxxviii for the term Chequers, undocumented until 1603.

[12] Beresford, "Six New Towns", p. 187-215. These two neighbouring bishops knew each other well; both had served in King Henry's minority government; David A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, Berkeley, 1990. The bishop of Winchester had endorsed the bishop of Salisbury's market privileges in 1219; Nicholas Vincent, *Peter Des Roches: An Alien in English Politics, 1205-1238*, Cambridge, 1996, p. 172, and *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri londinensi asservati*, ed. T. Duffus Hardy (hereafter cited as *RLC*), vol. 1, London, 1833, p. 387.

[13] Beresford, "Six New Towns", p. 211-212. Appendix II, p. 213, and the gazetteer in *New Towns* list contemporaneous plantations in central southern England prior to Salisbury.

[14] Quotation from Kaplan, *Questions of Travel*, p. 25; Rogers, "Salisbury", p. 3; RCHM(E), *Salisbury*, p. xxxiii-xxxiv. Incentives included court revenue not only from cases of justice and commerce but also from the manorial court of the bishop's demesne; Street, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 357; also Beresford, "Six New Towns", p. 193.

[15] Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 723; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 51, citing the Pipe Roll of 1130.

[16] Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 728; Rogers, "Salisbury", p. 4, pointed to irregularity in the grid, probably to accommodate water flow.

[17] *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543*, ed. Lucy Toulmin Smith, London, 1907, vol. 1, parts 1-3, p. 260.

[18] Flooding of the cathedral is noted first in the early fourteenth century coinciding with the cooler temperatures and greater rainfall of the coming Little Ice Age; Tim Tatton-Brown, personal communication, 2008.

Fig. 3. Roads and settlements of "Old Salisburies" before 1220. (after Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *Ancient and Historical Monuments in the City of Salisbury*, vol. 1, London, 1980 [RCHM(E)], p. xxx; re-worked by Virginia Jansen with graphics by Corri Jimenez)

Fig. 4. Medieval Salisbury with sites, streets, watercourses, river terrace and some elevation contours (heights are shown in feet above O.D.): 1. St. Edmund's Church; 2. Bishop's Mill (Town Mill); 3. St. Thomas's Church; 4. Market place; 5. Dominican friary site; 6. St. Martin's Church; 7. Cathedral; 8. Bishop's Palace; 9. Franciscan friary site; 10. de Vaux College; 11. Ayleswade Bridge (after [RCHM(E)], *Salisbury*, p. xxxv, and British Geological Survey, Sheet 298: *Salisbury*; re-worked by Virginia Jansen with graphics by Corri Jimenez)

millstream ran down the middle of the streets, occasionally bridged over (Fig. 4).[19] This system was an impressive development, even if not wholly unique as claimed. Such channels exist, for example, at Freiburg, Germany; Bern, Switzerland; and Kings Lynn and Stockbridge, England. These examples suggest that more medieval cities had water schemes than have been acknowledged.[20] At Salisbury larger water courses such as the Town Ditch also flowed past the market and served as a town drain, whereas the Close Ditch set the cathedral precinct apart as well as supplied water and drainage for a site that lay near the confluence of the Rivers Avon and Nadder.

The town may have taken a few years to become established. In 1219 Bishop Poore is recorded paying for a Friday market in *Veteri Saresberie*, a privilege extended several times.[21] It might have been a "starter market", for in 1227 a grant was made of a permanent market on Tuesday, probably adjusting the day to avoid competition with Wilton's Friday market.[22] In 1221 the king accorded the bishop an annual fair at "New Salisbury", the change in name now distinguishing the new town from the older settlements of the bishop's manor.[23] By 1225 or 1227 the bishop granted a charter setting out the legal basis of the town, including the rights and obligations of the burgesses as "free citizens", the ownership of plots in exchange for an annual fee, and the size of plots.[24] This charter as well as the royal charters and confirmation of 1227, which added further rights, clearly indicated that the city belonged to the bishop. The citizens owed him allegiance and taxes for the many rights he retained, for example those of justice and commercial customs such as "stallage", i.e., the fee for use of a market stall. Nevertheless, the plots were ample, the market place was large and well watered, the tenement fee allowed the citizens to be free of other taxes, and the citizens had the same liberties as burgesses in Winchester.[25]

[19] Some of the channels may have been constructed later and eventually wider and shallower to allow cart traffic. By the sixteenth century the water courses had become foul, and in 1737 were moved to the side of the streets; they were later paved over. See Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 95; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 89-90; Rogers, "Salisbury", p. 5.

[20] For example, Sandwich had an open water course and several underground conduits; Helen Clarke, Sarah Pearson, Mavis Mate & K. Parfitt, *Sandwich: The 'completest medieval town in England': A Study of the Town and Port from Its Origins to 1600,* Oxford, 2010, p. 37, 134, 159, 226, and *passim*. The water courses of Kings Lynn are documented in Vanessa Parker, *The Making of Kings Lynn: Secular Buildings from the 11th to the 17th Century*, Chichester, 1971, p. 26-27, who noted that their use as open sewers differed from the original purpose of Salisbury's; Beresford, *New Towns*, p. 508, mentioned Stockbridge (Hants.), where courses are still visible. Of course, monastic planners had used water conduits for centuries, as Peter Kidson reminded me; it would be surprising if this usage had had no impact on other kinds of planning.

[21] Samantha Letters, *Online Gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England and Wales to 1516*, <http://www.history.ac.uk/cmh/gaz/gazweb2.html>: Wiltshire (last updated 17 November, 2006); *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 52, and Marian K. Dale & Mary E. Ransome, "Markets and Fairs", in *ibidem*, p. 138; the extensions are cited in *RLC*, 1, p. 527, 542b, and 561.

[22] *RLC*, vol. 2, London, 1844, p. 195; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 138; Letters, *Online Gazetteer*, dated the Tuesday market to "1227x1241", but it must date before Bishop Poore's translation to Durham in 1228; the Tuesday market is also documented in the royal charter of 30 January, 1227 printed in Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 730, and in *Charters and Documents Illustrating the History of the Cathedral, City and Diocese of Salisbury in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, ed. William H. Rich Jones & W. Dunn Macray (Rolls Series, 97), London, 1891 [reprint Wiesbaden, 1965], p. 177. Although Salisbury lay just outside the traditional three-mile market sphere of influence for Wilton, Margery K. James, "The Borough of Wilton", in *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 15 and 17, concurred with the Wilton merchants in considering Salisbury too close. Beresford, "Six New Towns", p. 200, however, stated that in general two-and-one-half miles was considered "well away".

[23] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 52 and 140; Letters, *Online Gazetteer*; *RLC*, 1, p. 466; *Salisbury Charters*, p. 177.

[24] *The Tropenell Cartulary*, ed. J. Silvester Davies, Devizes, 1908, vol. 1, p. 187-188, and Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 43-44 and 728; ed. Brian R. Kemp, *Salisbury 1217-1228* (*English Episcopal Acta*, 19), Oxford, 2000, no. 379, p. 362-263. The traditional date for the bishop's charter is 1225, but discrepancies in the witness list have led Diana Greenway to suggest 1227, the year of the royal grants (see below), in John Le Neve's *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1066-1300*, vol. 4: *Salisbury*, comp. Diana E. Greenway, London, 1991, p. 14, n. 3.

[25] *Salisbury Charters*, p. 175-182; Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 729-730; Street, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 190-194.

Given that Wilton was a royal borough, one may question why King Henry III would want to permit a close competitor. Wilton, however, was not then under direct royal control; it was held by the king's mother Queen Isabella and her second husband.[26] Moreover, the king had reasons to favour Salisbury. Beginning in early 1220, pious Henry made donations to the new cathedral and visited it at both Christmastime 1219 and the foundation in 1220.[27] During the troubled royal minority Bishop Poore was one of several bishops involved in government, and in 1223-1227 he frequently attended the king at court.[28]

At least as consequential for Salisbury's success and the king's interest was his favoured palace, Clarendon. It was located about two miles east along medieval Winchester Street (now called Milford Street), which followed an old route across "Old Sarisberie" from Wilton to Clarendon (Fig. 3). Both Henry and his father frequently enjoyed "the largest royal deer park in England".[29] The procurement of large quantities of victuals and luxury products for a medieval court was complex and costly. Affording an adjacent source of supply, which Wilton had been providing, Salisbury now became a locus of economic opportunity.[30] Use of common architectural, glazed, and tile forms between the cathedral and the palace as well as the same quarry stone illustrate further connections between the two sites.[31]

In addition, Salisbury's easily accessible valley location encouraged rapid growth, undoubtedly luring merchants from Old Sarum as well as southern England. Its closer location to the port of Southampton enhanced its overseas trade. Pilgrims were enticed by indulgences and the stimulation of a new cathedral.[32] By 1269, with two of the three parishes closest to the cathedral built up, a third was laid out to the northeast.[33] In 1270 a second fair was granted, and in 1315 a third fair and a Saturday market.[34]

Only hindsight, however, shows how quickly Salisbury's economic triumph destroyed Wilton; in other circumstances increased trade nearby might have augmented the borough, as indeed did occur for a time.[35] Perhaps none reckoned with the forceful merchants and effective bishops of Salisbury. In contrast, the overlord of Wilton, by 1230 the king's brother Richard of Cornwall and thereafter Richard's son, was frequently absent during the period of Salisbury's initial growth. He collected the fee farm regardless of Wilton's commerce, whereas the rights of the bishop of Salisbury grew more lucrative with increased trade.[36]

In fact, evidence hints that the narrative of Salisbury's ascendancy might have been written differently. A legend, usually discounted by historians however much it makes sense of the historical

[26] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 8. In 1280, under control of the king's nephew, Wilton was not considered "in the king's hands"; *Ibidem*, p. 16.

[27] Gavin Simpson, "Documentary and Dendrochronological Evidence for the Building of Salisbury Cathedral", in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury*, ed. Laurence Keen & Thomas Cocke (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 17), 1996, p. 10-20; Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, p. 170; *Reg. S. Osmundi*, 2, p. 12.

[28] Kemp, *Salisbury 1217-1228*, p. 414-418; Fred A. Cazel, "Intertwined Careers: Hubert de Burgh and Peter des Roches", in *The Haskins Society Journal*, 1, 1989, p. 177-178; Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, p. 171, 322-323, and 389.

[29] Tom Beaumont James & Christopher Gerrard, *Clarendon: Landscape of Kings*, Macclesfield, 2007, p. 45-49.

[30] Previously noted in *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 124, and Lloyd, "Historical Introduction", p. 32, James & Gerrard, *Clarendon*, p. 53, have discussed the connection more particularly. Beresford, "Six New Towns", described the palace incentive, p. 190-193.

[31] Virginia Jansen, "Architectural Remains of King John's Abbey, Beaulieu (Hampshire)", in *Studies in Cistercian Art and Architecture* 2, ed. Meredith P. Lillich (Cistercian Studies Series, 69), Kalamazoo, 1984, p. 76-114, especially p. 85-86, Appendix 1, and fig. 12; Tom Beaumont James & Anne M. Robinson et al., *Clarendon Palace: The History and Archaeology of a Medieval Palace and Hunting Lodge near Salisbury, Wiltshire*, London, 1988, p. 153, 157, and 233-234.

[32] Street, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 194, note 2.

[33] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 69.

[34] *Ibidem*, p. 138 and 140; Benson & Hatcher, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 736; Street, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 195 and 219; Letters, *Online Gazetteer*.

[35] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 3; Beresford, *New Towns*, p. 231.

[36] Rogers, "Salisbury", p. 4.

geography, records that the bishop originally considered moving the cathedral to flourishing Wilton, to which the previous bishop had retired, but because not enough land was obtainable in the thriving community, which was hemmed in on a restricted river terrace, he resorted to his manor property.[37] The road system, however, privileged the established population. Therefore, executing in 1244 one of his chartered rights, the bishop had Ayleswade Bridge (often called Harnham Bridge since the fifteenth century) constructed over the Avon south of the cathedral (Fig. 4, #11).[38] Traffic now passed through Salisbury from the southwest coast to London and from London, Southampton, and Winchester to the western road. Previously travellers, merchants, and royal procurers had crossed the Nadder at Wilton or the Avon near Stratford-sub-Castle just southwest of Old Sarum.[39] With the new bridge, they paid tolls and traded at Salisbury instead. The diversion caused by the Ayleswade Bridge provoked the utmost economic displacement. As Leland wrote, "The chaunging of this way was the totale cause of the ruine of Old-Saresbyri and Wiltoun".[40]

To attribute the rise of New Salisbury and the concomitant decline of Wilton and Old Sarum to one cause, however, is to see events in brilliantly blinding *post festum* illumination. By the fourteenth century events were more unpredictable and complicated. Whereas in the thirteenth century the Salisbury citizens and bishop worked together, both welcoming the increased revenue, by 1302 the citizens' confrontations to gain greater liberties resulted in pointed disagreement. Thereafter, the citizens agitated continually.

In the conflict of 1302-1306 the merchants resisted a tallage tax.[41] Disregarding the bishop's chartered prerogative, the municipal authorities appealed to the king and council, who unremarkably decided for the bishop. After further skirmishing, the town "voluntarily" recognized the bishop's claim to lordship and "acknowledged that . . . their commercial privileges, which depended on his grant, were regulated by his will".[42] Yet soon again the citizens chafed against their overlord's jurisdiction, again without much success.[43] In 1450 during the unrest of Cade's rebellion, Bishop Ayscough was murdered.[44] Further struggles can be read in the city records, such as bickering between the city leaders John Hall and William Swayne, which disrupted municipal functioning and drained resources substantially in 1457 and other years.[45] In 1465-1474 a prolonged legal tussle with Bishop Beauchamp nearly bankrupted the community.[46] Only in 1612 in a different religious era and political climate did the town finally receive its own charter.[47]

For a time it seemed that Salisbury might also have displaced the university at Oxford, when it was suspended in 1238. Producing an economic surge, many masters and students moved to Salisbury, where the cathedral school and chapter had established a reputation for learning. In 1262, two years before Merton College was founded at Oxford, the bishop of Salisbury established de Vaux College (Fig. 4, #10), but by 1542 when it was dissolved, the Oxford scholars had long before departed.[48]

Nevertheless, the history of medieval Salisbury is more often a series of triumphs based on aggressive enterprise. It is perhaps better described from the perspectives of Salisbury's two neighbours, Old Sarum and Wilton. The town of Old Sarum vanished quickly once the cathedral corporation

[37] *Tropenell Cartulary*, p. 184-185.
[38] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 88; RCHM(E), *Salisbury*, p. xxxvii and 51.
[39] ROGERS, "Salisbury", p. 3. RCHM(E), *Salisbury*, p. xxxiii and xxxvi.
[40] *Itinerary of John Leland*, 1, p. 260.
[41] STREET, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 198-219; BENSON & HATCHER, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 75-78 and 739-740; *Tropenell Cartulary*, p. 189-199.
[42] Geoffrey TEMPLEMAN, "Ecclesiastical History 1087-1547", in *VCH Wilts.*, 3, p. 20.
[43] STREET, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 224-233 and 239.
[44] *Ibidem*, p. 227. *The First General Entry Book of the City of Salisbury, 1387-1452*, ed. David R. CARR, Trowbridge, 2001, p. xii.
[45] BENSON & HATCHER, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 136; STREET, "Bishops and Citizens", p. 239 and note 2, where a medieval "three-strikes" clause was laid upon the troublesome men.
[46] *Ibidem*, p. 233-257.
[47] BENSON & HATCHER, *Old and New Sarum*, p. 773-783.
[48] Kathleen EDWARDS, "College of De Vaux, Salisbury", in *VCH Wilts.*, 3, p. 369-385.

moved, even though the sheriff and royal administration were maintained into the fifteenth century, and in 1423-1424 Old Sarum still possessed a mayor and bailiff.[49] Indeed, the ascendancy of New Salisbury might have surprised even the canons: the central tower of the cathedral seems to be aligned with the street leading north to the castle (Fig. 4). Moreover, given the troubles of King Henry's minority, the residents of New Salisbury, as well as those of Old Sarum, Wilton, and the region, surely counted on the security of the fortified city. By 1255, however, the garrison no longer existed, but because of its secure site, Old Sarum retained the county jail until the beginning of the fifteenth century, even though criminals were increasingly sent to the new city after 1341.[50] Some burgesses also remained, and in 1246 the king approved an annual fair, but they had been losing business to Wilton since the twelfth century.[51] In the tallages of 1246 and 1269, the assessment for Old Sarum was abated, explicitly because of "its poverty" in 1269.[52] By 1377, when New Salisbury's poll-tax paying population was given as 3226, Old Sarum's was ten.[53]

Since the closest river access lay in the valley a quarter-mile away, Old Sarum's situation was unfavourable for the expanding commerce of the thirteenth century, even though many town parcels were located down the hill from the main plateau.[54] Similarly, the commercial new city of Carcassonne, founded in 1247 at river's edge, eventually reduced the fortified ducal city on the hill to a tourist site.[55] Rather than simply location, however, Salisbury's market privileges and patronage from the cathedral and Clarendon Palace were just as crucial factors in Salisbury's success.

Salisbury's displacement of Wilton was not so straightforward, however inevitable it seems now. Wilton's economic prowess and its burgesses, who had obtained the right to a guild merchant in the early twelfth century and a status generally comparable to that of London and Winchester, were well established. Its setting in a rich agricultural plain made it an early centre of exchange.[56] After the foundation of Salisbury, considerable trade continued, with merchants from Bristol, Winchester, Salisbury, and elsewhere buying at its markets.[57] The clientèle included victuallers supplying royal larders and cellars, as the royal monopoly on wine sales for southern England was based here.[58] Particularly notable was Wilton's needle-making industry in the thirteenth century.[59] An important Jewish community since the late eleventh century attested to the borough's commercial strength and royal protection. In the anti-Judaic troubles of 1264 the Wilton Jews, along with those in London and Cambridge, were safeguarded until this population was expelled in 1290.[60]

Until 1331 the royal justices of the eyre met at Wilton, which remained the seat of the county court into modern times.[61] Even as late as 1414 Wilton obtained the right to a new fair, but by this time, most of its bridges and churches had decayed, and after 1410 market stalls were rented sporadically, a sign of the town's decline.[62]

Perhaps the new bridge at Salisbury wounded Wilton fatally because Wilton was already failing on its own. Several thirteenth-century events point toward its decline. In 1230—fourteen years before the new bridge was built—the annual fee farm had been reduced from £40 to £30 for reasons of "poverty", unless the wily merchants instigated the reduction upon transfer of lordship.[63] In 1250 the

[49] Maurice Beresford, "Poll-Tax Payers of 1377", in *VCH Wilts.*, vol. 4, ed. Elizabeth Crittall, London, 1959, p. 306 and 311; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 72 and 63.
[50] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 54-56 and 59.
[51] *Ibidem*, p. 62-63.
[52] *Ibidem*.
[53] *VCH Wilts.*, 4, p. 312; Wilton's was 639.
[54] Hugh Shortt, *Old Sarum*, London, 1965, p. 32.
[55] Alain Lauret et al., *Bastides: Villes nouvelles du Moyen Âge*, Toulouse, 1988, p. 182-185.
[56] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 2 and 9. Wilton was a far stronger economic force than Old Sarum: the 1164 tallage assessed Wilton at one hundred shillings and Old Sarum at forty; the assize of 1173 taxed Wilton at one hundred shillings and Old Sarum at twenty; *ibidem*, p. 62.
[57] *Ibidem*, p. 13-14.
[58] *Ibidem*.
[59] *Ibidem*.
[60] *Ibidem*, p. 12.
[61] *Ibidem*, p. 15-16.
[62] *Ibidem*.
[63] *Ibidem*, p. 10 and 15; *Calendar of the Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III, 1227-31*, vol. 1, London, 1902, p. 325.

Wilton mint was shut down. At Wilton Abbey, which the Domesday survey listed as having the largest gross income of any English abbey for women, the buildings were declared ruinous by 1246, and in 1277 the knight service owed the king had fallen from five to one.[64] Similarly, placement of friaries may serve as an index of prosperity. While the Franciscans settled in Salisbury, the Dominicans built in Wilton, but by 1281 the latter had transferred to Salisbury, suggesting that in fewer than eighty years Salisbury with its educational communities had eclipsed Wilton as the foremost city in the county.[65] By 1296, the profit of the Wilton farm had dropped to £12. 13s. 4-3/4d., and in the tax assessment of 1334, Wilton was evaluated as eighteenth at 170s., whereas Salisbury was charged with 1500s. 2d., nearly five times the appraisal of the next affluent town.[66]

Most significant of all was the growing ability of the Salisbury market to rob trade from both Wilton and Old Sarum. When Salisbury was founded with a weekly market, Wilton was holding markets three times a week.[67] But in 1241, three years before the Ayleswade Bridge was built, the Wilton burgesses complained that markets were actually occurring daily in Salisbury, not just on the Tuesdays granted by royal charter.[68] Both Wilton and Old Sarum complained further in 1275 and 1281, while Salisbury countered that the Wilton bailiffs coerced merchants to trade there.[69] It is clear that even at the extreme penalty of forfeiting their goods, merchants and artisans were vending in Salisbury rather than elsewhere. Instead of capitulating, the Salisbury merchants retorted, as recorded in 1309, that they had the same right as any town to set up stalls and to display goods on any day of the week, implying that they were merely engaged in shop display, not in market activity. Nevertheless, in 1361 the town was directed to restrict its markets to Tuesdays and Saturdays, which occur to this day.[70]

By then Wilton's economic ruin was also issuing from within. The powerful guild merchant suppressed other attempts to form guilds (the tailors excepted) and successively enacted stifling regulations. Even more devastating, Wilton's merchants failed to exploit the growing cloth industry, the premier business of medieval commerce, which the Salisbury entrepreneurs aggressively pursued to their gain.[71]

From the perspective of the victorious, the growth of medieval and early modern New Salisbury seems to have developed methodically, while Wilton withered and Old Sarum became moribund. As can be seen from the protests over its markets and the ephemeral venture of a university, Salisbury essentially grew in a *de facto* as much as a *de jure* manner, like its city government which constantly struggled to wrest rights and privileges from the bishop.[72] In any case, the tax records of 1332 and 1334 show that Salisbury appeared as the tenth wealthiest city in England, and in 1377 seventh in population; by the fifteenth century it generally ranked fourth.[73] Salisbury had become five times larger than Wilton and had ten times its wealth.[74] In 1523 it was the seventh wealthiest city in England with a population of about eight thousand, but by 1576 its wealth was declining, placing it fourteenth or fifteenth.[75]

[64] Elizabeth CRITTALL, "Abbey of Wilton", in *VCH Wilts.*, 3, p. 233-234.

[65] Georgina R. GALBRAITH, "Dominican Friars of Wilton", in *VCH Wilts.*, 3, p. 330, and Georgina R. GALBRAITH, "Dominican Friars of Salisbury", in *ibidem*, p. 331.

[66] Richard Colt HOARE, *History of Modern Wiltshire*, vol. 2: *Branch & Dole*, London, 1825, p. 71, for the 1296 figure, and Maurice BERESFORD, "Fifteenths and Tenths: Quotas of 1334", in *VCH Wilts.*, 4, p. 303, Table 3, for the assessment of 1334; Old Sarum's appraisal in 1334 stood at 17s. 4d. in *ibidem*, p. 296.

[67] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 16 and 17.

[68] LETTERS, *Online Gazetteer*, and *Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III*, ed. L. C. HECTOR, vol. 16, London, 1979, nos. 1531, 1579, and 1689; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 17, using the date of 1240.

[69] *Ibidem*, p. 17 and 138; LETTERS, *Online Gazetteer*. HOARE, *Modern Wiltshire*, 2, p. 70, believed the Salisbury market to have been the "chief cause of the ruin of this town [Wilton]".

[70] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 138.

[71] *Ibidem*, p. 13.

[72] *First General Entry Book*, p. xii.

[73] Mary E. RANSOME, "Economic History before 1612", in *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 129; *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 72.

[74] *Ibidem*; *VCH Wilts.*, 4, p. 303.

[75] *VCH Wilts.*, 6, p. 129; ROGERS, "Salisbury", p. 7.

After provincial regeneration in the eighteenth century, it is today the largest city in the county discounting the "unitary authority" of Swindon.

When a new entity backed by ample resources, advantageous privileges, and a powerful, effective patron breaks into a nearly empty space, it may draw life from its neighbours, but the process is more complicated than an inevitable progress to pre-eminence. "A whole history remains to be written of *spaces*—which would at the same time be the history of *powers* (both of these terms in the plural) – from the great strategies of geo-politics to the little tactics of the habitat. . .[italics in the original]."[76] The foundation and dominance of New Salisbury were possible not only because of the new spatial-temporal geography of commerce, but also because of the politics of elite society performed across the medieval European landscape. These included the uses of the bishop's lands and his and the cathedral's privileges, educational advantages, and material requirements; the king's charters, grants, administration, and court procurement; and the pope's permission for the translation. Traditionally viewed from the perspectives of the religious prestige of its chapter, its innovative liturgy and organization, and the regular plan and model architecture of its church, Salisbury Cathedral together with its town might also be recognized for vigorous corporate capitalism.

Acknowledgements

The Arts Research Institute and the Academic Senate Committee on Research of the University of California, Santa Cruz, generously supported this study. Appreciative thanks go to Tim Tatton-Brown, who read this paper in draft and freely clarified several points, and to Nicola Coldstream for her judicious advice as ever.

Addendum

Received too late to figure into my discussion are the following:

Tim Tatton-Brown, "Reconstructing the Medieval Landscape around Salisbury," in *Sarum Chronicle*, 9, 2009, p. 30-36; Nicholas Orme, "Children and Education at Salisbury Cathedral, 1091-1547," in *Spire: The Eightieth Annual Report of the Friends of Salisbury Cathédral*, 2010, p. 20-27, especially p. 24-27; and Christian Frost, *Time, Space and Order: The Making of Medieval Salisbury*, Pieterlen, 2009.

[76] Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, New York, 1980, p. 149; also quoted in Kaplan, *Questions of Travel*, p. 143.

The Nave of Attleborough, Norfolk, and the Architecture of Unknowing

T. A. Heslop

The town of Attleborough lies midway between Norwich and Thetford, the two most populous urban settlements in Norfolk during the centuries either side of the Norman Conquest. Its position on the road connecting Norwich to Cambridge and, ultimately, London was a major contributor to its wealth and helps explain the relatively elaborate Romanesque church constructed there probably in the second quarter of the twelfth century. All that survives of this fabric is the crossing tower of a cruciform church, to judge by the arches opening under it in four directions. Whether the nave was aisled or not is uncertain, but the other three arms were almost certainly simple spaces.[1] The chances are that this building survived largely intact until the mid fourteenth century, since the major rebuilding of about 1370 contains many pieces of Romanesque moulded ashlar in its flint rubble walling, but no visible cut stone of any later date.[2] Furthermore as the reuse of this material is all above sill level, it is quite likely that the Romanesque nave was not demolished until the foundations and lower walls of the new work were well advanced. As built, the new nave is large and spacious, and remarkable in its structure and design (Figs 1 and 2).

Published analyses of the sequence of the later medieval campaigns at Attleborough vary. The discrepancies are instructive: broadly speaking there is a split between those such as Pevsner and Wilson who have deduced the dates of parts of the building from style, and those such as Fawcett or Haward who have used style to attribute churches to specific masons.[3] It is unfortunate but salutary that prioritising attribution and dating have uncovered fault lines. To bring the evidence into kilter, I argue that we must focus on the design and its aesthetic, in other words style has to be accounted for by other means than simply date and attribution. That involves questioning the still-prevalent model of stylistic progression from Decorated to Perpendicular, as well as the process of reconstructing careers for masons or architects on the basis of style alone, and finally recognising the interplay of circumstances, tradition and invention in the development of a design. It would be possible to demonstrate these points on any number of buildings. Attleborough has been chosen as a test case because the fabric is in fair condition, the documentation is sufficient, but most of all because the building is, for all its apparent stylistic indeterminacy, a wonderfully accomplished and aesthetically ambitious project. However, it cannot be understood in isolation, especially as some of the characteristics that have

[1] Thomas Chaunticleer built the north transept arm, circa 1370 (see below), including its east wall, so there was certainly no aisle north of the presbytery.

[2] Nikolaus Pevsner & Bill Wilson, *Norfolk 2: North-West and South* (The Buildings of England, 2nd edition), New Haven & London, 1999, p. 186, imply that the present south transept was founded by Sir William de Mortimer in 1297. He died in that year and was buried in the transept, but nothing earlier than mid fourteenth century survives of the building – see below. For the documentation see Francis Blomefield, *An essay towards a topographical history of the county of Norfolk*, 11 vols, London, 1805-1810, vol. 1, p. 508-509.

[3] Pevsner & Wilson, *Norfolk 2*, p. 185-187; Richard Fawcett, "Sutton in the Isle of Ely and its Architectural Context", in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Ely Cathedral*, ed. Nicola Coldstream & Peter Draper (The British Archaeological Association Transactions, 2), Leeds, 1979, p. 78-96. Birkin Haward, *Suffolk Medieval Church Arcades*, Ipswich, 1993, p. 406-407, while often seeking to create "oeuvres" for particular masters, was however unable to reconcile the arcade at Attleborough with Fawcett's proposed date, seeing in it "traits of the French inspired Fantastic style seen in Norwich, St Peter Mancroft" in the fifteenth century.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100130

Fig. 1. Attleborough, nave interior, looking east (T.A. Heslop)

Fig. 2. Attleborough, nave exterior (T.A. Heslop)

Fig. 3. Moulding profiles: a. Attleborough, wall arcade; b. Attleborough, nave pier profile showing the geometry of its design; c. Thetford Blackfriars, wall arcade; d. Thetford Blackfriars, tower arch (T.A. Heslop)

seemed precocious were anticipated in other local buildings, such as the parish churches at Gooderstone and Tottington, perhaps 25 years earlier, and the Dominican priory at Thetford, in the years around 1335. It is mendicant architecture that offers a potential explanation for some of the progressive aspects of Attleborough. However its design also has unique elements that represent a purposeful elaboration of the available models.

The most widely available account of Attleborough as a building is that by Pevsner, who makes a basic distinction between the style and execution of the window tracery in the nave aisles (circa 1340) and the main arcade (early fifteenth century). This has been followed by others.[4] It is however impossible to sustain the notion that windows and arcade are anything other than contemporary. The key to their unity lies in the wall arch responds in the aisles, which perfectly match the profile of the elements of the nave piers that face them (Fig. 3a and b). Furthermore, the responds are of the same stone, block size and quality of workmanship as the main arcades and so too are the similarly moulded arches and jambs at the east end of both aisles leading into the transept arms. The aisle walls must be the same

[4] Pevsner & Wilson, *Norfolk* 2, p. 185, 186. [Apart from the Norman tower] "The rest of the church is almost uniformly Dec of about 1340 apart from the nave arcades…. Then the nave was altered between 1405-36 by the provision of five tall bays of Perp piers, leaving the outer aisle walls and their windows intact". The chronology is followed by Haward (see above note 3), and again in his *Norfolk Album*, Ipswich, 1995, p. 4, 5 and 9.

date as the arcade, so the windows cannot be over fifty years earlier unless they are all reused. There is no support for that interpretation in the fabric itself: there are no signs of the adjustments, alterations or patches that normally accompany reuse. In order to justify the unity of the building further, it is necessary to discuss briefly what the physical evidence is for the sequence of construction.

At plinth level the fabric is an entity from the south-east corner of the southern transept arm to the south-west angle of the north transept arm. The plinth has upper and lower moulded ashlar courses of consistent height and profile framing a frieze of rectangles of alternating freestone and flint panels. This plinth follows the projection of each of the nave buttresses, including the angle buttresses on the southern end of the transept. The plinth of the north transept arm, in contrast, is higher and does not course through but lies up against the pre-existing north aisle wall. Above the plinth is a dado level of "snapped" flint, each nodule having been halved and built into the wall with its black core showing. This technique is also used for the aisle and west front buttresses to full height (though there is some later patching), but on the southern transept buttresses it rises only to sill level, suggesting a building break. We can therefore deduce that the nave and southern arm were laid out and built in a single campaign up to sill level, which is to say about head height, with the upward continuation of the nave walls following immediately. This incorporated the internal wall arches in the aisles and all the windows in the north, south and west walls, as we see them today.

The reason that the northern transept arm was not part of this campaign was that it resulted from an individual benefaction, by Thomas Chanticleer. He died in 1379 and in his will asked to be buried in the chapel that he had built.[5] For his chapel Chanticleer employed a different mason. This is evident from numerous details such as the geometry of the tracery: the basic design is the same as the aisle but the laying out is quite distinct and less regular than in the aisles, diminishing the symmetry and proportional balance of the original conception. Despite these disparities, the construction of his chapel was envisaged from the outset, since the arch leading into it from the north aisle is an integral part of the nave. Chanticleer's will thus gives us the terminal date for work on the nave as a whole.

Apart from style, uncertainty about the unity of the nave has been caused by documentation which is taken to refer to later campaigns of work. Most problematic has been the massive testamentary bequest of 2,000 marks by Sir Robert Mortimer to found a chantry college dedicated to the Holy Cross, for which licence was granted in 1405, eighteen years after his death.[6] However, the college was clearly based in the eastern arm demolished in about 1541 and insofar as it required new building work that is where it will have been focused. There was further work on the nave, but that involved building the north porch, raising the aisle walls and re-roofing the aisles and the main space. The north porch seems to have been funded by Sir John Radcliffe, who died in 1441, since a shield over the entrance once showed Radcliffe quartering Mortimer (his mother). The porch abuts the aisle but deliberately copies some of its details as if to make a point about continuity. Radcliffe's grandson, Lord Fitzwalter, has been linked with the heightening of the aisles and the re-roofing of the church.[7] Up to this point the evidence prioritises the patronage of Robert Mortimer and his wife, and then the descendents of their granddaughters. After Fitzwalter was beheaded for treason in 1496 the initiative may have passed to

[5] Blomefield, *An essay towards a topographical history*, p. 505 and 527 for Chanticleer's burial. His will is registered in Norwich Consistory Court, Heydon, as number 162.

[6] G. E. C[okayne], *The Complete Peerage*, 9 (London, 1936), 243-50: Mortimer of Attleborough.

[7] Fawcett, "Sutton in the Isle of Ely", p. 81.

Fig. 4. Little Cressingham, nave, interior (T.A. Heslop)

parishioners as there are bequests in 1505 and 1506, respectively from Peter Littleproud to make clear-stories and from William Leach for the roof.[8]

This reference to clearstories has prompted some commentators to regard the present upper level as an addition, a case that could also be supported by what looks like an earlier roof line on the inner face of the west wall above the north side of the central window. The view that the clearstory is an addition has also persuaded commentators that it is later in style. However, Richard Fawcett argued persuasively that the design of the tracery of the upper nave windows goes with that at the west end of the aisles. As regards tracery, mouldings, stone type and the fabric of the wall into which the windows are set it does seem as though the clearstory was an integral part of the project of circa 1370. Similar designs are found in the aisles of Little Cressingham (Fig. 4), ten miles to the west, which has other links with the fourteenth-century work at Attleborough and is convincingly attributed to the same mason.[9] That it is the same mason and not just the same designer is also suggested by the equally high quality of execution and the use of unusual techniques, such as tracery flushwork on the same scale as the windows themselves. In the circumstances Littleproud's bequest may have been for reglazing rather than building work.

The uncertainty about dating the clearstory is indicative of the weakness of style categories for determining absolute chronology. Can the supposedly Decorated tracery of the aisle windows be contemporary with the supposedly Perpendicular arcade and the windows above it? The problem here is entirely associated with the nineteenth-century taxonomy still used for categorising medieval architecture. During the phase of architectural (and art) history, coinciding with evolutionary and developmental models in science and social science, when 'form' was the best available approximate guide to date, the taxonomy served its purpose. But, having lingered and been reified, such style names can obstruct our understanding of particular monuments and prompt anachronistic ideas about aesthetic coherence (or lack of it), and characteristics such as the regional development of "lozenge" piers. The latter point can be pursued further because local developments are certainly significant, though it will be argued that there are larger cultural imperatives as well.

One way open to us in identifying the resonance for contemporaries of the distinctive characteristics of Attleborough's design is to seek precedents in other buildings. The lozenge plan of its nave piers, longer on the north-south than the east-west axis, has been regarded as a very recent innovation, perhaps even an invention of this architect.[10] However, it can be found perhaps 25 years earlier in the church at Gooderstone, twenty miles to the west (Fig. 5). As at Attleborough, tracery and arcade share stone type and mouldings, and the quality of the cutting and detail of the profiles show they are unitary. Here too the south aisle (there never was a north aisle) is opened up to the nave by the strategy of minimising the east-west dimension of the supports. However, the moulding is much simpler. In plan it comprises two half columns either side of an attenuated octagon. It has been dated to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, apparently because it is seen as a primitive "Perpendicular" form, but that does not begin to tally with the other evidence.[11] In January 1342 the advowson of Gooderstone was transferred by Marie de St-Pol, Countess of Pembroke, to her new foundation for Franciscan nuns at Denny in Cambridgeshire. Marie had been widowed in 1324 at the death of the Earl of Pembroke,

[8] Paul Cattermole & Simon Cotton, "Medieval Parish Church Building in Norfolk", in *Norfolk Archaeology*, 38, 1983, p. 235-279, here p. 237.

[9] Fawcett, "Sutton in the Isle of Ely", here p. 83-90.

[10] *Ibidem*, p. 89.

[11] Haward, *Norfolk Album*, 48, writes of a "Dec south aisle and porch added. Four bay Dec or early Perp arcade". This distinction derives from Nikolaus Pevsner, *North-West and South Norfolk* (The Buildings of England), London, 1962, p. 173: 'Dec s aisle.... Dec (or Early Perp) s arcade', later echoed in Pevsner & Wilson, *Norfolk* 2, p. 361. Haward seeks to provide actual dates: in his summary tables (page 4) the arcade is dated to the fifteenth century, but in the conspectus of Pier Group 3B (page 9) Gooderstone is assigned circa 1380.

Fig. 5. Gooderstone, interior, south aisle looking southeast (T.A. Heslop)

Aymer de Valence, and devoted much of her very considerable wealth and energy to fostering religion until her own death 53 years later. Her patronage of art and architecture included a surviving Franciscan breviary (made in Paris circa 1330) as well as building at Denny.[12] She may well also have been responsible for her husband's tomb in Westminster Abbey. Her control of Gooderstone for 50 years makes her involvement there practically certain.

At Gooderstone, the pier design serves two purposes which may have helped determine its character. One was to make visible the impressive glazing and curvilinear tracery of the aisle windows. The glass in the east window shows a Last Judgement. Christ bust-length in the top centre, has a censing angel to either side and, below, two angels with trumpets raising the dead from their tombs. A canopy survives in one of the three main lights, probably indicating that there were once saints beneath. The implication of the scheme is intercessory, more commonly found in relation to tombs and memorials than east windows. Along the south wall, the tracery light glazing contains vegetal forms, as though to enhance the organic and "florid" implications of the mouchette tracery that contains it. But perhaps the most remarkable contribution to the vitality of the architecture is the piscina, which takes a highly unusual double form because each compartment has a cupboard above.[13] This effectively turns its front face into a cross, an association that is strengthened by two characteristics. The first is the basin support very ostentatiously projecting from the wall surface to the left. It draws attention to the notional importance of the wound in Christ's side and its relationship with the consecrated wine in the chalice, which would be washed into it. The second is the gable above the piscina, in which the blind tracery deliberately echoes the flowing, flowering tracery of the windows. In other words the cross is sprouting. Franciscan devotion to the Cross, exemplified by the founder's vision and stigmatisation, is the kind of background that seems necessary to prompt the extraordinary "invention" that is the Gooderstone piscina.[14] The second purpose of Gooderstone's design may thus have been iconographic, recalling mendicant imagery and architecture, in which the requirement for audibility as well as visibility was paramount. The overall "message" of the south aisle seems to relate Christ's passion to Judgement at the end of time. So far as we can tell from surviving schemes, it is a very ambitious, unified and well-executed programme for a parish church, but it is plausible given the patronage of the church and the circumstances in which the aisle was built.

The proposition so far as it has developed is that it is in designs with mendicant associations from the first half of the fourteenth century that we might expect to find some of the characteristics of Attleborough nave. There is some direct support for this in the fragmentary surviving evidence. The Dominican friary at Thetford, founded in 1335, has fully developed, moulded wall arches along the north aisle (Figs 3c and 6). A reasonable inference is that the piers had similar mouldings to face them, perhaps with a half column in between. The only other surviving profiles at the Friary, on the south arch to the central tower, supports that possibility since the jambs take the form of halved diamond piers of the Gooderstone type, though with a "bracket" moulding applied to the chamfers (Fig. 3d).[15] Fragmentary as they are, the remains of Thetford's Dominican friary provide us with many of

[12] Victoria County History, *Cambridge and the Isle of Ely*, vol. 2, London, 1948, p. 295-302, and A.R. Martin, *Franciscan Architecture in England*, Manchester, 1937 (reprinted 1966), p. 256-65. For the breviary, Richard and Mary Rouse, "Marie de St-Pol and Cambridge University Library MS Dd.5.5.", in *The Cambridge Illuminations: the Conference Papers*, ed. Stella Panayatova, London & Turnhout, 2007, p. 187-192.

[13] Thus, the window next to the piscina has a half-octagonal rear-arch responding exactly to the facing nave pier. Furthermore, at least one block of stone is common to both.

[14] Although the iconography of the sprouting Cross was not uniquely Franciscan, and indeed had a good English pedigree, its popularity in the later Middle Ages was greatly enhanced through St Bonaventure's writings; see Rab Hatfield, "The Tree of Life and the Holy Cross: Franciscan Spirituality in the Trecento and Quattrocento", in *Christianity and the Renaissance: Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento*, ed. Timothy Verdon & John Henderson, Syracuse, NY, 1990, p. 132-160.

Fig. 6. Thetford Blackfriars, interior, north aisle wall (T.A. Heslop)

the characteristics of Attleborough including size, since their naves are of very similar dimensions, about 50 by 85 feet, of five bays, and with aisle walls some 22 feet high and identical window mouldings.[16] The scale is similar to other mendicant naves of the period, such as the Franciscan church at Walsingham, Norfolk, founded in 1347, and more widely across the country.[17] There is thus possibly an iconographic or even ideological discourse into which Attleborough can be fitted, and which contemporaries may have readily discerned, but there is also a structural one.

Thetford seems to have presaged one of Attleborough's most remarkable features: its lightness of build, with thin walls and tall slender columns.[18] The nave arcades at Attleborough have bays 16½ feet wide and 30 feet tall to the apex of the arch. Of that height over two thirds, 21 feet, comprises the piers, with their bases and capitals. With the single exception of North Walsham, this makes Attleborough's supports the tallest surviving from fourteenth-century Norfolk. They were scarcely exceeded in height in the fifteenth century anywhere in East Anglia. Even more impressive is the cross-section, a mere 1'9" by 2'7", which means that the area is approximately 325 square inches or 2.25 square feet.[19] Thus the height to cross-section ratio is over 9:1. That is astonishingly slender by any standards: at North Walsham the ratio is only 6:1.[20] The data from Attleborough demonstrate that the impression given by the nave of openness and lightness does not rely simply on illusionism, it is very real. We may deduce that these characteristics were a priority since the designer pushed the limits of structural viability as it was understood from experiment and empirical observation in earlier, but mendicant, buildings.

What is original about Attleborough, so far as we can tell, is the ways in which aesthetics and tectonics interact. The point may be developed with reference to the mouldings of the piers, which has a local prototype at Tottington.[21] The conceptual core of their design is four contiguous shafts, of equal diameter, arranged as an elongated quatrefoil (Fig. 3b). However the east and west profiles of the piers undulate: there are no cavities or angles, but rather broad, triple corrugations held together, at north and south, by short, flat continuations of the wall plane down the supporting member. The effect is nebulous in the sense that there are no corners except the leading edges where highlighted and shaded areas may be sharply distinguished. Everywhere else there is a seamless gradation of tone across the

[15] Christopher Norton, Paul Binski & David Park, *Dominican Painting in East Anglia: the Thornham Parva Retable and the Musée de Cluny Frontal*, Woodbridge, 1987, p. 87-90.

[16] Thetford was 1'6" wider than Attleborough and with a length at least 78' internally.

[17] Walsingham was founded by Elisabeth de Burgh, Countess of Clare, a close friend of Marie de St Pol: Martin, *Franciscan Architecture,* p. 125-137 for the history and architectural remains. It is noteworthy that both countesses and the founder of Thetford, Edmund Gonville, also founded Cambridge colleges.

[18] The apex of Thetford's wall arches is 17' above current ground level, but as there are no signs of plinths or bases we may suppose by analogy that medieval floor level is now at least three feet below the surface. Three well-preserved sections of window moulding survive in the grounds of Thetford Grammar School which indicate the aisle wall thickness. They have the same profiles as those in Fawcett's Fig. 5a-c (Fawcett, "Sutton in the Isle of Ely"). Of the buildings attributed by Fawcett to the Attleborough mason, Sutton in Cambridgeshire is the closest as it has identical wall arch and window moulding profiles. It is likely that Thetford's nave piers were similar to Sutton's, that is 31" north-south and about 21"-24" east-west. The north-south dimension at Thetford can be deduced from the surviving respond fragment at the west end of the south arcade.

[19] As it is based on a diamond, it has roughly half the area of a rectangle 21 x 31 inches.

[20] Haward, *Norfolk Album*, p. 88-89, for the dimensions.

[21] Tottington is in the Battle Zone and has thus largely escaped scholarly attention. Provisionally, I would link its nave and west tower with the south aisle at Gooderstone on the basis of mouldings and tracery, and thus date it around 1340. Intriguingly, the Mortimers of Attleborough were implicated in the patronage of Tottington at the period. The dedication of the church to St Andrew does not initially encourage the kind of reading I offer for Attleborough, but it should be noted that the only guild at Tottington apart from the patronal one was of the Birth of the Virgin and it may be this rare devotion that prompted the design of the piers.

Fig. 7. Attleborough, nave pier and capital (T.A. Heslop)

surface which softens its solidity, almost like Leonardesque sfumato. The light on these piers comes mostly from the aisle windows and the west window rather than the clearstory. Particularly towards the east, away from the influence of the west window, the illumination of the nave faces of each pier would have been diminished. The view down the nave seems like a journey from the fairly substantial to the increasingly mysterious. It is only at the upper level of capitals and hood moulds that greater definition is asserted, helped by the light from above. All these design decisions involve subtle adjustments, of two or three inches of relief. In particular the structure of the pier and its relationship with base and capital are quite extraordinary. The nebulous quality of the support is uniquely indicated by the ways in which most of the capital disappears in one side of it, and reappears on the other, as though emerging either side of a cloud. Only the uppermost section of the impost surrounds the pier as it rises up to the clearstory (Fig. 7). The base mouldings suggest a similar conception: gentle undulation partially obscures the crisp materiality of the form. In these respects, Attleborough is a clear development of the arrangement at Tottington where, as at Gooderstone, the fillets facing north and south on each pier run uninterrupted from the plinth into the wall surface of the arcade spandrel. There are no other bases or capitals like Attleborough's in late medieval East Anglia, or as far as I know anywhere else. The contrast with the designer's work at nearby Little Cressingham is very pronounced. It is reasonable to infer that a very particular set of circumstances lies behind their invention.

Attleborough is dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin Mary and much of the surviving imagery shows how important she was in the devotional fabric of the church. In the fifteenth century the central boss of the north porch was carved with her coronation, and she is represented flanked by the two biblical St Johns on the screen. The west window retains substantial fragments of a fourteenth-century Annunciation, perhaps always in that location. Among the most resonant texts relating to Mary liturgically were the Song of Songs and chapter 24 of Ecclesiasticus, which provided readings and chants for several of her major feasts. In Song 3.6 the beloved asks "who is she who ascends from the desert like a column of smoke?" (*quae est ista quae ascendit per desertum sicut virgula fumi*). In his exegesis on the passage, Honorius Augustodunensis identifies Mary as "she that goes up to the palaces of heaven", and continues "what follows seem to be the Church's words on the Assumption of the body of Mary". In Ecclesiasticus, wisdom personified speaks: like a mist I have covered the whole earth, I have lived in the heights and my throne is in a column of cloud (*sicut nebula texi omnem terram. Ego in altis habitavi et thronus meus in columna nubis* (Ecclesiasticus 24, 6-7). The phrase "column of cloud" is repeated many times in the Bible, beginning with the Exodus when God's chosen people are led from Egyptian captivity by a pillar of cloud (Exodus 13, 21-22). Subsequently God appears in this form at the entrance to the tabernacle (Numbers 12.5). The mystery was taken as a typological metaphor: God concealed in a pillar of cloud and God incarnate veiled in Mary's body provided a nexus of allegories for the ineffability of the deity and his human realisation, through Mary, in Jesus Christ. This interaction of the physical and the spiritual is akin to the ways in which the form of the pier partially subsumes but also supports its capital.

But there was another very contemporary sense in which holy mysteries were dissolved in that space which both connects and fails to connect heaven and earth: the text now known as *The Cloud of Unknowing*.[22] Attributed to an author from the north-east Midlands, around 1370, it deploys the analogy of cloud and darkness for those things beyond intellectual and sensual apprehension: "just as this cloud of unknowing is, as it were, between you and God, so you must also put a cloud of forgetting beneath you and all creation." [...] "Work … in this nothing and this nowhere, and put on one side your outward physical ways of knowing".[23] At the end of the treatise, in chapters 71-3, we learn how

[22] *The Cloud of Unknowing, and Related Treatise on Contemplative Prayer*, ed. Phyllis Hodgson, Exeter, 1982.

[23] *The Cloud of Unknowing and Other Works*, trans. Clifton Wolters, London, 1961, p. 66, 144.

Moses dwelt and worked for six days in a cloud before he could "see" the Ark of the Covenant. Thus the devout leader was inspired, but Bezaleel did the work and made it and Aaron guarded and accessed it in the temple ("Bezaleel wrougt it & maad it …. Aaron had it in keeping … to fele it & see it as ofte as hym likid").[24] Here, then, was an Old Testament analogy for patron, artisan and priest co-operating in making "as it were some sort of spiritual ark".[25] By acknowledging "St Dionysius" as his authority, the writer effectively declares what is patent enough, the mystical and neo-platonic roots of his approach to contemplative religion. This explains the juxtaposition of the indeterminability of the divine and the analogy of materiality that underpins *The Cloud* and, I suggest, is the best way to understand the very particular architectural nuancing that we encounter, uniquely, in the nave of the parish church at Attleborough.

Paradoxically, one of the advantages of attributing Attleborough and Little Cressingham to the same designer is to emphasise how different they are in conception and realisation. His creativity is evident from his imaginative responses to the varied tasks he undertook rather than to rigid, or even stable, authorial aesthetic predilections. Perhaps that very flexibility has contributed to making his work difficult to categorise. Neither stylistic developments per se nor the other buildings that have been attributed to the same master prepare us for the combination of structural daring and flowing aesthetic at Attleborough. I suppose they were devised for reasons other than simply demonstrating originality, since that is too open-ended a brief to lead to such a specific solution. The specificity must lie in part with the patrons, whether secular ("Moses") or sacred ("Aaron"), who chose as their model a building such as the nave of Thetford friary but also indicated the ways in which it should differ and the ideas they wished to communicate.

There is a space around form and expression, between and beyond what is said and how it is said, where the work of communication is done. Architectural history has tended to inhabit a "never-never" land in which iconography and its performance are kept separate. That is unfortunate, for master masons, unlike playwrights or composers of music, perform their "texts" for perpetual reception, as it were imbuing the letter with spirit. While, as the author of *The Cloud* makes clear, not everyone brings the same knowledge or receptiveness to the business of understanding the holy mysteries, it is especially hard for us now: we are so far removed from the world of medieval religious devotion. We can hope to discern the motivations of patrons and masons only once we have analysed the character of each building in relation to others and sought to accommodate it to patterns of thought current in their culture. It is entirely appropriate that the exercise should be contemplative and speculative since these activities would have informed both the likely causes and intended effects of an architecture linking the realities of the world and of heaven through a zone of unknowing.

[24] *The Cloud of Unknowing,* ed. Hodgson, p. 71-72.

[25] *The Cloud of Unknowing*, trans.Wolters, p. 149.

The Lodgings of Henry Percy, 4th Earl of Northumberland (circa 1449–1489), Warkworth Castle, Northumberland

John Goodall

Spectacularly set above the River Coquet, Warkworth is amongst the most celebrated castles in Northumberland (Fig. 1). Much of the recent literature on this important building has focussed on its great tower or *donjon*, an acknowledged masterpiece of the Perpendicular Style. Despite arguments being put forward to the contrary, it is now generally agreed that the great tower was built by the master mason John Lewyn at the behest of Henry Percy, 1st earl of Northumberland, in the last quarter of the fourteenth century.[1] As yet, however, little attention has been given to the domestic lodgings that developed within the bailey of the castle in the shadow of this building. These are scarcely less significant in architectural terms.[2]

As they presently survive, the bailey lodgings are the cumulative product of two principal phases of construction. The first of these took place in the early thirteenth century, when the motte and bailey castle was probably first laid out in its existing form by Robert Fitz Roger between 1199 and 1214.[3] From this period there survive the substantial remains of a domestic range against the west wall of the bailey. The centrepiece of the range was a ground-floor hall divided internally by an arcade. In conventional English fashion, a buttery and pantry stood at one end of the hall. At the other was a two-storey chamber block, its interiors communicating with well-appointed rooms in the south-west angle tower of the bailey. The upper room in the block – presumably the great chamber – was directly connected to the dais of the great hall by a stair in the thickness of the castle wall.

A short distance from this range there was also constructed the impressive twin-towered gatehouse of the castle. This building has an unusually large and complex plan for the early thirteenth century. It possessed a large domestic chamber on its upper floor, a feature that anticipates the much larger and very influential gatehouse designs at castles such as Dover (built after 1217) and Tonbridge (probably of the 1250s), both in Kent. This interior was lit by large windows opening into the courtyard of the castle. The gatehouse may have served originally as independent lodging for the constable of the castle.

This group of thirteenth-century buildings was cannibalised in a major rebuilding programme undertaken in the late fifteenth century by Henry Percy, 4th earl of Northumberland (d. 1489). He recast and expanded them to create a rectangular courtyard within the bailey. As part of his work, the existing hall and chamber were reconstructed with low-pitched roofs and provided with a new courtyard facade (Fig. 2). Punctuating this long facade were two imposing tower porches, of which the larger – called the Lion Tower – served as the entrance to the hall. It preserves a spectacular array of heraldic sculpture. This is one of the most elaborate in a long tradition of external heraldic displays in Northern English castles, as at Hylton in County Durham (erected in the 1390s) or the inner bailey gatehouse of the Percy seat at Alnwick in Northumberland (built after 1333).

[1] See Leslie Milner, "Warkworth Keep, Northumberland: A Reassessment of its Plan and Date", in *Medieval Architecture and its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson*, ed. Eric Fernie & Paul Crossley, London, 1990, p. 219-228, and Malcolm Hislop, "The Date of the Warkworth Donjon", in *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 19, 1991, p. 79-92.

[2] The two standard existing accounts of the castle are Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales*, vol. 1, Cambridge 1996, p. 144-150 and the much more detailed John C. Hodgson, *A History of Northumberland*, vol. 5, Newcastle, 1899, p. 18-119.

[3] John Goodall, *Warkworth Castle* (English Heritage Red Guide), London, 2006, p. 34-35.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100131

Fig. 1. A view of Warkworth Castle, Northumberland showing the great tower and the bailey buildings beneath (photo John Goodall)

Fig. 2. Reconstruction and cut-away of the hall range at Warkworth Castle, Northumberland, as rebuilt by Henry Percy 4th Earl of Northumberland between 1472 and 1489 (Reconstruction drawing by Chris Jones-Jenkins, copyright English Heritage)

The centrepiece of the display is a huge sculpture of a lion – the heraldic beast of the Percys – with a crescent collar bearing the family motto *esperaunce* or "hope". Above this are two heraldic achievements, each one formerly crowned by a helmet with a cap of estate and mantling. These respectively display the arms of the Percy *ancient*, a heraldic blazon that passed out of formal use by 1343, when the seal decorated with it was smashed ceremonially at Warkworth.[4] To the right are the worn remains of three fishes or *luces* that identify in pun the Lucys, from whom the Percys inherited a substantial portion of their estates in the fourteenth century. In effect, the visitor is here presented in heraldry with a dynastic history of the family since their arrival on the Northern March in the early fourteenth century.

At the top of the heraldic panel are three much smaller badges representing the late fifteenth-century connections of the Percys. One represents the portcullis or *bascule* of the Herberts, into which family the 4th earl married in 1472. Presumably, therefore, work to the porch and the remodelling of the lodgings in the bailey post dates this marriage alliance. Early descriptions of the building also record that one of these badges – which is now completely illegible – incorporated the spread wings of a bird. This was possibly part of the fetterlock device of the house of York.[5] If so, the porch can further be dated prior to the Tudor victory at the battle of Bosworth in 1485.

The second tower porch is known as the Little Stair Tower. It was extensively rebuilt in the 1920s, an operation which has created confusion over some points of its original design. This tower incorporated a small stair that gave access to the first-floor great chamber through a richly vaulted first-floor porch.[6] Providing what are in effect privy and public entrances to the great chamber and great hall respectively looks back to the planning of royal palaces, notably Edward III's mid-fourteenth-century apartments in the Upper Ward at Windsor Castle.[7] One detailed point of comparison with this particular precedent is that the Little Stair Tower (like its counterpart, the Rose Tower at Windsor)[8] had on its upper floor a chamber for privileged use with access to the leads and with fine views over the park. In both cases, these rooms almost certainly served as banqueting rooms.

Two additional buildings were constructed by the 4th earl at right angles to the renovated hall and chamber range so as to form a courtyard within the bailey. From the great chamber one range projected along the line of the curtain wall towards the gatehouse of the castle. Within this was created a first-floor chapel with a closet opening off the great chamber. It is likely that the principal bedchamber within the domestic apartments of the bailey was henceforth in the large upper chamber of the thirteenth-century gatehouse. If so, it would explain why the 5th earl is described as having used this room as his bedchamber in 1538.[9]

Forming the opposite side of the new courtyard, and partially concealing the remodelled kitchen and services at the low end of the hall, was a second chapel. This chapel was laid out across the full width of the bailey with the east end raised above vaulted crypts and a subterranean passage, the latter intended to form the principal approach to the great tower on the motte. The chapel was planned with a nave, transept and chancel. Its surviving pier bases suggest by their irregular design that there was no intention to vault the interior. The size of the crossing piers also indicates that a central tower was planned. Despite its grand architectural form, the constraints of the bailey forced the mason to miniaturise the transepts and nave. In the latter, for example, the arcade piers are no more than ten feet (three metres) apart.

[4] *The Percy Cartulary*, ed. M. T. MARTIN, (Surtees Society, 117), Durham, 1911 for 1909, p. 481.

[5] HODGSON, *History of Northumberland*, 5, p. 90-92.

[6] The stair is shown, for example, in Charles HARTSHORNE, *Illustrations of Alnwick, Prudhoe and Warkworth*, London, 1857, plate 38.

[7] Christopher WILSON, "The Royal Lodgings of Edward III at Windsor Castle", in *Windsor: Medieval Archaeology, Art and Architecture of the Thames Valley*, ed. Laurence KEEN & Eileen SCARFF (The British Archaeological Association Transactions, 25), Leeds, 2002, p. 19-23.

[8] *Ibidem*, p. 44-47.

[9] HODGSON, *History of Northumberland*, 5, p. 57.

Fig. 3. Warkworth Castle, Northumberland, a detail of the heraldic sculpture on the Lion Porch (photo John Goodall)

Fig. 4. York Minster, a detail of a vault in the pulpitum screen, probably 1470s (photo John Goodall)

The intention of building this second chapel was almost certainly to create a Percy family mausoleum served by a college of priests within the walls of the castle. There were prestigious parallels for such undertakings in this period, most notably Edward IV's remodelling of St George's Chapel as a new royal mausoleum in Windsor Castle from 1475. Entrance to the new chapel was also through the Lion Tower that served as the porch to great hall, one of several details proving that the chapel is contemporaneous with the 4th earl's building operations between 1472 and 1485.

The detailing of the Lion Tower offers one notable insight into the architectural context of the remodelling of Warkworth by the 4th earl. Forming the support for the lion sculpture is a stone bracket cut in the form of two fan vaults (Fig. 3). These are the northernmost examples of this distinctive vaulting type, which since its inception in the cloisters of Gloucester Abbey (now the cathedral) in the 1350s was always closely connected with masons in the orbit of the King's Works. The Warkworth master mason was, in fact, almost certainly drawn from York Minster, where major works were underway to the shrine of St William and the pulpitum screen in the 1470s.[10] In evidence of this connection, the Warkworth bracket closely parallels one vault in the York Minster screen (Fig. 4). This particular point of comparison aside, Warkworth shares with the screen other generic similarities: the clustering of miniature buttresses and pinnacles in the framing architecture and the inclusion of small angels playing musical instruments. It would make perfect sense for the earl of Northumberland to borrow craftsmen from York Minster, the cathedral of the archbishop of York and the most important church in Northern England.

Of the kitchens and services created to serve the 4th earl's new lodgings, little now survives above ground. They were evidently arranged around a courtyard that served as a firebreak between the fires of the kitchen and the hall. One intriguing survival in the ruins of a roasting fireplace is a masonry channel for collecting dripping off the spit.[11] The new kitchen, like its predecessor, was supplied through a service gate on the west side of the castle.

Having described this remarkable courtyard house in the castle bailey it is worth asking one overarching question about it: why did the 4th earl of Northumberland create a complete suite of domestic apartments that duplicated those in the fourteenth-century great tower? Certainly, the great tower was not abandoned by the earl. Indeed, it probably continued to afford the most prestigious accommodation in the castle and descriptions of the tower into the seventeenth century emphasise its exceptional magnificence.

Explanation for this duplication probably lies in the operation of the earl's household. By the fifteenth century great noblemen were evidently travelling on a regular basis with a formally constituted inner household, a body sometimes known as the "Riding Household". In 1512 the earl's son, Henry Algernon Percy, 5th earl of Northumberland, for example, maintained a great household one hundred and sixty-six strong, but his riding household comprised thirty-six men.[12]

It seems probable, therefore, that the domestic apartments in the great tower were intended for use by the riding household of the earl of Northumberland on visits of pleasure. When his great household descended, however, the bailey buildings (possibly in conjunction with the great tower) were pressed into use to accommodate the greater numbers it comprised. Quite when riding households first came into existence is an open question, but the duplication of domestic apartments in castles with great towers remains common from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries at buildings such as Dover and Bolsover.[13]

[10] The pulpitum screen incorporates at least two phases of work and still awaits authoritative analysis. The most detailed consideration to date is John HARVEY, "Architectural History from 1291 to 1558", in *A History of York Minster*, ed. Gerald E. AYLMER & Reginald CANT, Oxford, 1977, p. 185-188

[11] Peter BREARS, *Cooking and Dining in Medieval England*, Totnes, 2008, p. 309

[12] *The Earl of Northumberland's Household Book*, ed. Bishop T. PERCY, London, 1905, p. 45 and 150-151.

13 John GOODALL, *The English Castle* 1066-1650, New Haven & London, 2011, p. 158-160.

The earl's alterations to the bailey buildings were almost, but never quite, completed. Disgusted by his politic hesitation to join the fighting at the Battle of Bosworth before a clear winner had emerged, the earl's household apparently abandoned him to a mob during a tax riot on 28 April 1489.[14] As a result, the chapel was recorded as standing incomplete in 1533, when furnishings from it were moved into storage (incidentally, the unexpected death of the earl probably explains why the foundation of the college is not documented).[15] The hall and chamber range were evidently well-advanced by the time work was abandoned, though the service buildings may have been partially incomplete. To confuse matters, however, there is evidence that these buildings were stripped out in preparation for remodelling less than two years before the Northern Rising of 1569.[16] Thomas Percy, 7th earl of Northumberland, was directly implicated in this disastrous rebellion. After fleeing into Scotland he was handed over to the English authorities and executed in 1572. During his disgrace Warkworth was systematically despoiled by an unscrupulous royal official. The bailey apartments have remained ruinous to the present day.

[14] Steven G. Ellis, "Percy, Henry, Fourth Earl of Northumberland (c.1449-1489)", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21935, accessed 10 October 2008].

[15] Hodgson, *History of Northumberland*, 5, p. 55-56.

[16] *Ibidem*, p. 63

Orthodoxy, Religion and Architecture in the Early Sixteenth Century: The Patronage of Bishop Fox at Winchester Cathedral

Linda Monckton

"Since the course of this useless life is fleeting and transitory, and here (as the Apostle said), we see no continuing city, but seek another heavenly one, therefore I Richard, of the Church of Winchester (though unworthy) bishop and minister, hastening to the aforesaid city in hope of entering it, by the grace of God and not by any merits, clearly perceiving that because in a short while my handful of days will be at an end, and following the counsel of the prophet to Hezekiah (Isaiah 38,v.l) who said, 'Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die.'"[1]

These words, dictated by the eighty-year old Bishop of Winchester,[2] and forming his last will and testament reveal two crucial aspects of Fox's personality. One is his humility, integral to his piety, and the other is his readiness, the result of his having spent the previous quarter of a century putting his own house in order. The architectural and artistic works carried out by Richard Fox during this period reflect these two characteristics.

As patrons late medieval bishops were innovators in the architecture and institutions of commemoration and display. They introduced cage chantries and cadaver monuments in England, were innovative in their establishment of educational colleges and transformed palace architecture.[3] Despite their wealth and influence they themselves were dependent upon royal favour, so that a mutually beneficial and supporting system of patronage, favour and service to the Crown and to the Church existed.

In common with many medieval bishops, especially those enjoying the enviable rewards of the See of Winchester, Richard Fox, was a great diplomat, builder and courtier. But even a cursory glance at Fox's career and his architectural patronage reveals a number of characteristics that stand him apart.

This story begins one day in late fifteenth-century Paris, when a young student of canon law met the exiled Henry of Richmond. On Henry's subsequent succession to the English throne this man became the beneficiary of Tudor royal patronage. Within fourteen years Richard Fox had been granted four bishoprics in fast succession, Exeter 1487, Bath and Wells 1492, Durham 1494 and culminating in Winchester in 1501. The last he held until his death in 1528. As bishop of Winchester, Fox was as wealthy as "all but the king" and a handful of lay magnates, holding as he did one of the 30 richest bishoprics

[1] Angela Smith, *The Life and Building Activity of Bishop Fox c.1448-1528*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1998, Appendix 10, p. 473. I am grateful to Angela Smith for kindly supplying copies of her published works.

[2] His precise birth date is unknown but it is thought to be circa 1447-8, for which see Smith, *Bishop Fox*, p. 59.

[3] John Goodall, *The English Castle 1066-1650,* New Haven & London, 2011: Fox was amongst those who set the scene for the creation of Hampton Court by Wolsey, discussed in chapter 14. For a recent published debate on the influence of fifteenth-century episcopal residences on the development and form of the early Tudor royal palace see Simon Thurley, "The Cloister and the Hearth: Wolsey, Henry VIII and the Early Tudor Palace Plan" in *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 162, 2009, p. 179-195.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100132

in Christendom. He was a statesman, royal clerk and diplomat and has been described as "the most influential clerical patron of English humanism in the age of Erasmus".[4]

Fox became the closest aide to the first Tudor monarch. He maintained an extraordinary involvement in Tudor politics including ensuring the stability of the realm; as a religious reformer and humanist he both witnessed and shaped the reign of Henry VII. This position and his longevity was a combination that afforded Fox incredible opportunities as a patron.

As a rebuilder of castles and cathedrals, a founder of perpetual chantry foundations including an educational college, Fox at once appears the model late medieval bishop. In general terms his patronage is not dissimilar to that of his illustrious predecessors Bishops Wykeham, Beaufort and Waynflete. Certainly there is much about his patronage that exemplifies common (episcopal) trends in the Late Middle Ages. And it is the architectural and artistic expression of Fox's devotion and material wealth with which this article is concerned. A brief article such as this cannot hope to do justice to the entire topic of Fox's patronage, and it is his work at Winchester Cathedral between 1501 and 1528 that will form the focus of this paper.

Winchester Cathedral in 1501

On arriving in Winchester, Fox found the cathedral in possession of a stone-vaulted, fully glazed nave splendidly rebuilt by two of his predecessors. Begun by William Edington in the 1360s, who completed the west front and westernmost bays, the nave was entirely remodelled at the behest of William Wykeham. Wykeham, with his mason Wynford, changed the detailing of the nave providing a main central aisle defined by its architectural consistency, which became a model for late medieval architecture (Fig. 1). Its completion, after Wykeham's death in 1404, was carried out with his legacy and in accordance with his wishes by his successor as Bishop of Winchester, Cardinal Beaufort (1404-47).[5]

Elsewhere in the cathedral Fox found, by comparison, a hotchpotch of architectural language. At the east end was the incomplete chantry chapel of his predecessor Bishop Langton and the recently refurbished and re-vaulted Lady chapel. Although a monastic project, being initiated and completed by two priors (Hunton and Silkstede), its Westminster-inspired architecture and Eton-inspired paintings, betray an emulation of episcopal patronage.[6] Both projected from the thirteenth-century,[7] stone-vaulted retrochoir, the focus of the shrine of St Swithin since the translation of his relics in 1476.[8] The creation of a new setting for the saint had involved the construction of the great screen, which in turn

[4] Brian Dobson, "Two Ecclesiastical Patrons: Archbishop Henry Chichele of Canterbury (1414-43) and Bishop Richard Fox of Winchester (1501-28)", in *Gothic Art for England 1400-1547,* ed. Richard Marks & Paul Williamson, (exhibition catalogue London, Victoria and Albert Museum), London, 2003, p. 234-236.

[5] Wykeham left 2,500 marks for the completion of the nave, 500 of which were to be put towards the cost of glazing – for which see John Dolbel Le Couteur, *Ancient Glass in Winchester,* Winchester, 1929, p. 15. Also see Smith, *Bishop Fox,* p. 151. The text of Wykeham's will is in Robert Lowth, *The Life of William Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester,* Oxford, 3rd edition 1777, Appendix, p. xxxii-xliii.

[6] Fox appears to have been responsible for the completion of Langton's chapel, see Smith, *Bishop Fox*, p. 152.

[7] The retrochoir was initiated shortly before 1204 and completed before 1238 by Bishops Godfrey de Lucy and Peter des Roches respectively. For an analysis of this work see Peter Draper and Richard K. Morris, "The Development of the East End of Winchester Cathedral from the 13th to the 16th century", in *Winchester Cathedral: Nine Hundred Years,* ed. John Crook, Chichester, 1993, p 177-182.

[8] The bones were removed from the Anglo-Saxon reliquary in 1450 and stored for 26 years before being relocated in the new shrine (personal comment by John Crook).

Fig.1. Winchester Cathedral nave, view west (Linda Monckton)

Fig. 2. Winchester Cathedral south retrochoir aisle housing Beaufort's chantry chapel and looking west towards Fox's chapel (Reproduced by kind permission of John Crook)

Fig. 3. Winchester Cathedral north elevation of north transept (Linda Monckton)

Fig. 4. Winchester Cathedral fourteenth-century presbytery arcade with inserted clerestory windows (Reproduced by kind permission of John Crook)

had determined the location of the burials of Bishops Beaufort and Waynflete.[9] The chapels of these men dominate the retrochoir through placement and sheer architectural brilliance (Fig. 2).

In between stood the presbytery and transepts: the latter remained in their monumental eleventh-century state, only altered *de minimis* by the insertion of various fourteenth-century windows to enlarge openings. By the sixteenth century both transepts still appear to have been covered by open timber roofs.[10] Although the north transept roof is much later (and more will be said of this below), that of the south is ascribed by dendrochronology to circa 1301. In style it emulates that of the west end (dated to the thirteenth century and under which Wynford had recast the nave).[11]

The Romanesque presbytery had stood in its entirety until the early fourteenth century, at which time the central vessel was rebuilt. Unlike the later nave this did not preserve walling from the previous build in or above the new arcade, but it did retain the aisle walls. New choir stalls were made at this time (commissioned shortly after 1300); the south transept roof was renewed; the eastern chapels of both transepts were refurbished and the end wall of the north transept was refenestrated (Fig. 3).[12] More substantial rebuilding occurred in the presbytery with the construction of a new arcade and clerestorey, undertaken in stages between circa 1310 and the 1330s, and including the feretory screen (Fig. 4).[13]

Peter Draper has set out the potentially uncomfortable relationship that must have existed between the Romanesque apse as partially destroyed and the thirteenth-century retrochoir.[14] Even more abrupt disjunctions occurred through the combination of the fourteenth-century new works with the various phases of the old, made "permanent" by Bishop Edington's subsequent decision to refocus attention on the west end. This left the presbytery with a fourteenth-century main elevation, linked to eleventh-century aisle walls, which, as Richard Morris has already pointed out, could not have retained their Romanesque stone vaults,[15] and must have been covered by open timber roofs, by virtue of the clear and substantial misalignment of the new presbytery piers with the earlier aisle responds. All this adjoined the vaulted thirteenth-century east end.

What has not been conclusively dealt with previously is the date of the current clerestory windows in the presbytery (Fig. 5). These cannot be contemporary with the elevation below and must have replaced a fourteenth-century series, as demonstrated by the jambs which are clearly early fourteenth century. One might reasonably suggest that the previous clerestory was in appearance much like the series of early fourteenth-century windows in the east aisle of the north and south transepts (Fig. 6).

[9] John Crook, "The Architectural Setting of The Cult of St Swithun in Winchester Cathedral, 1093-1538" in *The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester* ed. Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle & Martin Biddle (Winchester Studies vol. 4.i), forthcoming.

[10] The timber vault in the crossing was inserted in 1634. The transepts are illustrated still with open roofs until circa 1819 when timber ceilings were inserted. For this and more detail on the roof structure see Julian Munby & John Fletcher, "Carpentry in the Cathedral and Close at Winchester", in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Winchester Cathedral*, ed. Thomas Heslop & Veronica Sekules (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 6), Leeds, 1983, p. 101-111.

[11] I am most grateful to John Crook for directing me to this reference and also for generously discussing all aspects of this article with me and most particularly for spending an invaluable day with me in Winchester Cathedral. Daniel Miles & Michael Worthington, "List 91: Hampshire Dendrochronology Project – Phase Four Tree-Ring dates from Oxford Dendrochronology Laboratory", in *Vernacular Architecture*, 29, number 1, 1998, p. 120-21: item 9 -nave roof felling dates winter 1246/7 to winter 1249/50 (although note that the 5 westernmost bays were rebuilt after a fire in 1698); south transept roof felling dates spring 1306 to spring 1318 (that they suggest is the year in which the roof was constructed).

[12] Morris describes this as series of largely uncoordinated campaigns rather than a coherent building programme – although in totality quite extensive, see Draper & Morris, "The East End of Winchester Cathedral", p. 182-183.

[13] *Ibidem*, p. 182-187 for details and full explanation of phases.

[14] *Ibidem*, p. 180-182.

Fig. 5. Winchester Cathedral presbytery, north clerestory window (Linda Monckton)

If the design of the presbytery elevation owes anything to Exeter Cathedral,[16] then the possibility of alternating and varied decorated windows seems likely.

Willis had assumed the current windows were inserted by Bishop Edington (1345-1366),[17] implying refenestration of these high level windows within about twenty years of their early fourteenth-century completion, at a time when the bishop was also reconstructing the west front. This seems unlikely and Edington's evident focus on the west end does not sit well with sporadic works in the choir. More conclusively, the mullions for the windows are of a type only found in the cathedral after

[15] *Ibidem*, p.188-189.

[16] *Ibidem* p. 183 for a brief discussion of the relationship between these two buildings and the closely related dating of the presbytery elevations.

[17] Robert Willis, *The Architectural History of Winchester Cathedral*, (Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute at Winchester, September 1845), London, 1846, (repr. Winchester 1980), p. 48. Willis was "inclined" to attribute this work to the early part of Edington's episcopate, based on the difference between the jamb and mullion mouldings and the vaguely Perpendicular appearance of the work.

[18] In brief Edington's work favours a series of ever diminishing rolls with canted fillets, based on the model of the south transept at Gloucester Cathedral; a distinct break with this tradition is seen on the arrival of Wynford and the new design under Wykeham – the canted fillets are dropped completely and mullions and responds have three rolls separated by chamfers or one roll separated from a hollow chamfer by a chamfer. This form is then used for the works to Winchester College, also under Wynford and through the later works at the cathedral including as late as the presbytery aisle windows under Fox.

Fig. 6. Winchester Cathedral exterior view of south transept showing insertions of tracery from Edington's campaign (left) and from circa 1310-1330 (centre and right) (Linda Monckton)

the arrival of Wynford and his clear change of templates in the late fourteenth century.[18] The tracery design does not match that known to be favoured by Edington, although there are some residual similarities, for example in the stacking up of simple reticulated units over cinquefoil cusped lights (see Figs 5 and 6).

A series of other possibilities has been suggested for the date of these ranging from a late fourteenth-century completion, a late fifteenth-century refenestration when the great screen was built to an early sixteenth-century remodelling as part of Fox's work to the east end.[19]

The vault of the presbytery has also been subjected to many interpretations, mostly premised on the assertion by Cave in 1927 that the bosses, demonstrably related to Fox, were additions to an earlier structure (Fig. 7).[20] There is certainly no sign that the presbytery was stone vaulted in the four-

[19] Willis, *Winchester Cathedral, p.* 48. Morris, *Winchester Cathedral,* p. 189 suggests options of a break in the presbytery works at the time of the Black Death requiring a late fourteenth-century completion and making for an extremely protracted campaign or a late fifteenth-century option.

[20] Smith suggests the possibility that the vault could be as early as Witney (in the 1310s or thereafter) in Smith, *Bishop Fox,* p. 159. Charles John Philip Cave, "The Bosses on the Vault of the Quire of Winchester Cathedral", in *Archaeologia,* 76, 1927, p. 161-178.

Fig. 7. Winchester Cathedral presbytery vault (Linda Monckton)

teenth century. It was either left open to the roof, like the aisles and the transepts, or given a wooden ceiling. The design of the vault is of no help in dating as it is a direct copy, albeit on a different profile, of the nave vault of circa 1400.

Uncertainty has traditionally characterised our understanding of the precise appearance of the presbytery on Fox's arrival. What is clear, however, is that the nave's uniformity contrasted significantly with the eastern arm of the building and that excepting the retrochoir and Lady chapel the east end was largely or completely unvaulted and certainly contained no stone vaults. Even if it is accepted that the medieval observer would not have made the stark distinctions between aesthetic properties of so-called "styles" as the modern categorising eye, disjunctions between campaigns were surely evident.

Fox's contribution

On his translation to Winchester, Fox left unfinished the works to Durham Castle,[21] and seemingly immediately transferred his attention to the appearance of Winchester Cathedral - the home of his new episcopal throne - the east end of which must have appeared somewhat lacking in coherence.

Fox has previously been credited with the reconstruction of the east gable wall, with glazing in the presbytery and its aisles, with the presbytery aisles and vaults, with the bosses on the presbytery vault and by some, with the vault onto which the bosses are attached. Heraldic evidence dates the bosses of the high vault to between 1503 and 1509. Their iconography has been accounted for by others.[22] The date of the presbytery aisles and vaults is less clear – either they pre-date 1509 based on limited heraldic evidence or they post-dated 1513,[23] the date of a now well-known indenture between the bishop and the prior.[24] The indenture, which is principally concerned with management of works of Fox's educational foundation at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, states that any remaining money should be used to build a new stone vault over St Swithin's shrine and "of the making and vaultinge with stone of two Isles upon the side of ye same Church". Lindley has hypothesised that this refers to the aisles of the retrochoir.[25] Others usually assume that it refers to the presbytery aisles, but Lindley's hypothesis is appealing and makes sense of the reference to the shrine and the heraldic dating evidence. This evidence also suggests that the next place Fox intended to spend his money was the retrochoir. The lack of work in this area and the transepts implies that in the event Fox's money was spent on his college.

[21] Goodall, *The English Castle*, p. 394-395.

[22] See Phillip Lindley, "The medieval sculpture of Winchester Cathedral", in *Winchester Cathedral*, ed. Crook, p. 177-182; Martin Biddle, "Early Renaissance at Winchester", in *Winchester Cathedral*, ed. Crook, p. 257-304, p. 263 and 298 note 41 and Cave, "Bosses", p. 161-178. For a detailed description of the bosses including an evaluation of Cave's analysis see Smith, *Bishop Fox,* p. 163-185. This interpretation takes as read the interpretation that the vault and the bosses are of different dates.

[23] Harvey suggests that the vaulting of the aisles was not carried out until the 1530s when he states that the mason Thomas Berty was under contract to do it. Harvey appears however to be depending upon a reference in the *Compotus Rolls* (see below note 26) although this does not specify that the work is to the presbytery aisles and appears to be relating to repairs not construction in the east end of the building: John Harvey, *English Mediaeval Architects: A Biographical Dictionary down to 1550,* Gloucester, revised edition 1987, p. 21. I am extremely grateful to John Crook for discussing this interpretation with me. Harvey seems to overplay Berty's contribution to the cathedral works and furthermore Berty was in fact the mason to the cathedral priory rather than to Bishop Fox himself, for which see Harvey, *English Mediaeval Architects*, p. 21. Once Fox had funded construction of the cathedral the maintenance and repairs would have been the responsibility of the priory and this would fit with the evidence that Bertie, under the aegis of the prior, was responsible for repairs to the fabric.

[24] See Smith, *Bishop Fox*, for a transcription of the Indenture, Appendix 5, p. 378 *passim*.

[25] Lindley, "Medieval sculpture", p. 117-118.

Although refining the date of construction of the aisle vaults would be useful, two significant facts remain regardless. First, that Fox was responsible for the works of the presbytery aisles and vaults is undeniable given the heraldic evidence.[26] Second, the south aisle vault must have been completed before his chantry chapel (described as newly built in 1518), the location of which had been selected by Fox before 1513 (as mentioned numerous times in the indenture). The works to the aisles preceded planned works to the transepts: there is clear architectural evidence that the east aisles of these were to be removed indicating an intention for significant recasting of the entire central part of the cathedral (see Fig. 6).

Lindley, Munby and Fletcher have between them put to rest the endless debate over the date and builder of the presbytery high vault. Lindley points out that the sculptured corbels on which the vault rests are carved with Fox's insignia and must relate to the construction of the vault. What it replaced is hard to say, either an open roof or a wooden ceiling, all evidence for which is now gone. The roof structure above has produced no less a debate on date, and many before have posited that the reconstruction of the east gable wall clearly took into account an existing roof structure.[27] Munby and Fletcher however state that the roofs of the presbytery and north transept are remarkable, related and should be assigned to Bishop Fox.[28] Most importantly they state that the presbytery roof was designed for the vault over which it stands. Certainly the combination of its unusual construction (alternately raised trusses apparently specifically to accommodate the form of the vault) and the apparent heightening of the fourteenth-century wall plate reinforce this.

One might ask what drove Fox to rebuild an east presbytery gable (hardly a major or visible façade) if it were not associated with the reconstruction of the roof. Fox was almost certainly responsible for the infilling of masonry between the closely set thirteenth- and fourteenth-century piers of the retrochoir and presbytery east end; this must relate to his reconstruction of the roof and associated gable above. That Fox embarked upon a more comprehensive rebuilding and recasting of the presbytery must, in my view, be linked to a reference of 1532 in an account roll: *Eidem Willelmo plumbario operanti super novam voltam Episcopi Fox per duo dies*.[29] This reference suggests repairs to an existing vault referred to as Fox's "new" vault to distinguish it from others and it is suggested here that this is synonymous with the high presbytery vault.

The clerestory windows of the presbytery, on both north and south elevations, as mentioned above, have undergone rigorous assessment too. Almost every conceivable bishop in the fourteenth or fifteenth century has been named as a potential candidate for their insertion. The dependence of the mullions on Wykeham/Wynford inspired details, their overall aesthetic relationship to an early to mid-fifteenth-century preference for simplicity in the south east (for which see numerous works in London and Oxford) and the residual relationship to elements of the Edington scheme combine to demonstrate that they are fifteenth century and post-date the nave works. Their difference from Fox's

[26] Luxford cites independent documentary evidence for the presbytery vaults: see Julian Luxford, *The Art and Architecture of English Benedictine Monasteries, 1300-1540: A Patronage History,* Woodbridge, 2005, p. 60-61 and note 76. This is drawn from a reference to a new vault in the *Compotus Rolls*, although it is Kitchen's editorial contribution that suggests this might relate to the presbytery aisles, which are not otherwise specified. For which see George William Kitchen, *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St Swithin's Priory Winchester,* Hampshire Record Society, 1892, p. 217 and note 1, and also note 23 above.

[27] See for example Smith, *Bishop Fox,* p. 159 for her interpretation along these lines and a summary of earlier hypotheses.

[28] Munby & Fletcher, "Carpentry in the Cathedral", p. 105-107.

[29] See Kitchen, *Compotus Rolls,* p. 217. Kitchen's assumption that this refers to the chancel aisles as referred to above (note 26) is based on the presence of Fox's symbols on what he recognised as late Perpendicular work.

windows in the presbytery aisle suggests they are not likely to be his, but most conclusively they contain stained glass of the fifteenth century that is *in situ*.[30] Precise dating of this glass is problematic: it has been suggested as early or mid-fifteenth century by Smith and Le Couteur respectively.[31] It bears some resemblance to the works of the nave in terms of format, even though stylistically it differs. Two possibilities for the glass and the windows may be offered. One is that Beaufort continued the works he had overseen in the nave, updating the presbytery to bring it more in line with the west end by replacing its early fourteenth-century windows. Alternatively his successor Waynflete may have overseen a similar exercise. Circumstantial evidence favours Beaufort as the initiator: he appears to have been responsible for a shift in emphasis back to the east end of the building, notably the decision to erect the great screen, relocate St Swithin, and his related request for burial in the retrochoir.[32] More precise attribution probably hangs on a more detailed survey of the glass. And regardless of this, it is clear that Fox was not responsible for these windows.

In summary therefore Fox's rebuilding of the eastern gable was required as a result of his re-vaulting and re-roofing of the presbytery. The oft-perceived uncomfortable relationship between the vault and its bosses[33] resulted from his use of an older design combined with the desire for a Tudor approach to self-representation.

Put simply Fox, on his arrival, wholly appropriated the presbytery of the cathedral for his own. That this appropriation was explicit is clear from the repeated use of his motto and heraldry particularly in the upper light of each presbytery aisle window, and in the eastern third of the presbytery vault.[34] Compounding this significance, this bay forms a canopy over the east bay of the presbytery which houses the ancient feretory, this area behind the high altar had housed the church's relics since at least the mid-twelfth century when a platform was constructed;[35] rebuilt in the fourteenth century this platform had become a visually discrete space from the presbytery with the construction of the Great Screen in the fifteenth century (Fig. 8). Fox chose the location of his chantry chapel before 1513 to enclose the south side of this platform (Fig. 9). Whilst on one hand this may be seen simply as the most prestigious of the available spaces, it is rather further evidence of Fox's integrated approach to identifying this part of the building with his commemoration.

The location and arrangement of the chapel ensures that it is pivotal in the main liturgical foci of the eastern arm of the cathedral (Fig. 10). It has a physical relationship with the feretory platform,

30 The *in situ* glass is towards the west end of the choir on the north and south side. For an account of this glass see Le Couteur, *Ancient Glass*. I am wholly indebted to Anna Eavis and Richard Marks for looking at the presbytery glass on site with me. Any misinterpretation here expressed, however, remains my sole responsibility.

31 Angela Smith, "'As my Lord of Winchester shal devise': Richard Fox and early 16th century stained glass in England", in *Journal of Stained Glass,* 31, 2007, p. 35 – 52, p. 36 and Le Couteur, *Ancient Glass,* p. 31, who suggests circa 1450-60.

32 This may be further complicated by the fact that Waynflete oversaw the completion of works initiated by Beaufort with regard to the screen and shrine. However the hypothesis that Beaufort's campaign to liturgically re-order and re-define the east end linked directly to a scheme of glazing, which at once ensured some consistency with the works of his predecessor and enabled a new iconography for the presbytery, remains appealing.

33 This debate has centred on the fact that the heraldic bosses are large and appear to sit over the top of the ribs and small foliate bosses of the vault. They are pegged separately onto the vault, as clearly seen from above the vault surface, and are therefore separately carved objects. It has in the past been wrongly perceived that they are, therefore, secondary and not part of an integrated design.

34 Whilst much of the glass at this end of the presbytery was moved from the nave in the seventeenth century there is clear evidence for Fox's reglazing of the easternmost side windows and the east window in the presbytery. For this see Le Couteur, *Ancient Glass,* p. 34-40 and also Smith, "As my Lord of Winchester shal devise", p. 35-52.

35 For a full account of the feretory and the shrine location of St Swithin see John Crook, "St Swithin of Winchester", in ed. Crook, *Winchester Cathedral,* p. 57 – 68.

Fig. 8. Winchester Cathedral easternmost bay of presbytery over feretory platform (Linda Monckton)

Fig. 9. Winchester Cathedral feretory platform and its surrounding features, with Fox's chapel (right) (Reproduced by kind permission of John Crook)

Fig. 10. Winchester Cathedral chantry chapel of Bishop Fox (Reproduced by kind permission of John Crook)

Fig. 11. Winchester Cathedral view west from presbytery showing high vaults (Linda Monckton)

to which it is open on its north side (see Fig. 9). Additionally it faces south, its main "show façade" for the passing clerics and pilgrims who would have swept through an aisle already dominated by royal and episcopal insignia and by the Marian imagery of Fox's windows. Amid all this splendour his low-set cadaver acts as a modest counter-point. In addition Fox manages to make a direct and personal link with Swithin, through the construction of a tiny oratory at the east end of the chapel, where surely Fox used to pray between 1518 and 1528. He would have faced the painted decoration of the fourteenth-century feretory screen enclosed by the chapel's construction whilst having a direct view of the shrine of St Swithin. His chapel firmly places him in relation to all the cathedral's most holy locations. And it sits enshrined by his building, glazing and vaulting schemes.

Architectural decorum

Fox's chantry chapel is now attributed with good reason to the master mason William Vertue, responsible for court works in the early sixteenth century,[36] and stylistically it refers directly to the works of Henry VII in his chapel in Westminster and that of St George's Windsor. The chapel contains no effigy aside from the cadaver, therefore not presenting the abrupt contrast between living and dead in the pre-eminent English transi tomb by Chichele in Canterbury. Its court associations however, would not be lost on his contemporaries, and through this his role in court and affiliation with the Tudor dynasty was described in stone in perpetuity. To consider this a secular representation in contrast to the holy space he redefines around him is, of course, to find a separation of sacred and secular where none existed in the Middle Ages. But the architecture of the chapel appears to represent one dominant characteristic of his life, his close connections with Henry VII and his related involvement in the commissioning of many of the monarch's most significant works of art and architecture.

In direct contrast to this manifestly court work is the high level work to the presbytery. The vault of the presbytery and its aisles consciously and directly emulate those of the nave (Fig. 11).[37] The east window, faces onto and reflects in its design directly, the great west window (see Figs 1 and 8). In combination these decisions ensure an architectural consistency with the nave and with the north and south clerestory windows (here ascribed to Beaufort), through visual reference. That this was a conscious decision is proven by the contrast with the exterior of the eastern gable which, being seen in isolation from the rest of the building, comprises polygonal turrets surmounted by ogee "onion domed" canopies and panelling straight from the court repertoire (Fig. 12); and to this one might add the aisle tracery which sits comfortably within its sixteenth-century panelled walling, lacking the close proximity to the high level presbytery works. His approach to the glass reflects this same interest in achieving some degree of aesthetic unity. Le Couteur details how the easternmost clerestory windows as newly glazed by Fox are "almost unique in being a close and fairly accurate copy of yet older work".[38] The angels, wrapped in their own feathers ensure that the scheme continues to be read as one unit, despite the technical differences in the style of the canopies and figures.

In view of an attribution to Fox of an entire scheme of recasting, the words of his indenture take on a particular meaning when he specifies that the

> "vaultinge [of] …stone of two Isles upon the side of ye/ same Church
> [and the vaultinge of the Cross-Isle in ye sayd Cathedrall

[36] Angela Smith, "The Chantry Chapel of Bishop Fox", in *Winchester Cathedral Record,* 57, 1988, p. 33-37.

[37] The pitch of the presbytery high vault differs from the nave but the disposition of the ribs is the same.

[38] Le Couteur, *Ancient Glass,* p. 39.

Fig. 12. Winchester Cathedral, detail of east gable wall and stair turrets (Linda Monckton)

> Church of Winchest[er] with stone after the manner [and] forme of the vaultinge of ye sayd cathedrall Church".[39]

If Fox had carried out his instructions to the letter he would have achieved a total transformation of the eastern arm of Winchester Cathedral that would have rivalled Wykeham's achievement and ensured Fox's place in the list of great cathedral builders. He must have had the unified interior of St George's Windsor in his mind and one might speculate that he aimed to achieve, what would have later been considered by architectural historians no doubt, as a comparable model "Perpendicular" interior for Winchester.

Fox's decision to show respect for the earlier works through reflection and revival forms a contrast to his chantry and to the work of some contemporaries, such as Bishop King. King re-vaulted, with a fan vault (which became a symbol of court works of the early sixteenth century), a partially complete late medieval reconstruction of Bath Abbey, thus demonstrating his appropriation of a space through architectural reference.[40] Fox used these models only for his personal chapel, and his approach for the cathedral church may have reflected a conscious desire to express historical continuity in the context of Winchester. Ultimately this may reflect the importance of Winchester's antiquity to its self understanding, a fact most clearly expressed through the redisplay of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs in new caskets on top of the presbytery screens, a project carried out by Fox with the priory after the completion of the other works (see Fig. 4).[41] But equally it signifies Fox's conservatism through an acknowledgement of historical tradition.

Fox was inevitably a man whose sum was more than his parts, and the range of his artistic patronage is no less. The glass of the east window is manifestly contemporary in character and shows an awareness of northern European models, with which he would have been familiar via his commissioning of Barnard Flower to paint the windows of King's College.[42] The screens, although later and perhaps the result of joint patronage with the priory,[43] are well known for the interest in renaissance detailing that they display.[44] Fox's foundation at Corpus Christi broke with many of the traditions of teaching and book collection of it predecessors and has been described as the first renaissance college in Europe.[45] This results from his radical reforming and forward looking intellectual approach. But

[39] Smith, *Bishop* Fox, Appendix 5, p. 378 *passim*.

[40] The West Country had been characterised by a tradition of inventive lierne vaults throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, for which see Paul Crossley, "Wells, the West Country, and Central European Late Gothic", in *Medieval Art and Architecture in Wells and Glastonbury*, ed. Nicola Coldstream & Peter Draper (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 4), Leeds, 1981, p. 81-109; Paul Crossley, "Peter Parler and England: A Problem Revisited", in *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 64, 2003, p. 53-82; and Linda Monckton, "Experimental Architecture? Vaulting and West Country Cloisters in the Late Middle Ages", in *The Medieval Cloister in England and Wales* (Journal of the British Archaeological Association, 159), 2006, p.249-283 and for Bath see Linda Monckton, "Bath Abbey: A Re-assessment of its Patronage and Architectural History", in *Church Archaeology*, 10, 2006, p. 1-16.

[41] The screens were inserted in the 1520s as part of a re-ordering including re-entombing the figures that surrounded the presbytery under the arcades and the provision of new mortuary chests housing the bones of the Anglo-Saxon kings, queens and bishops which has previously been situated on the feretory screen. For this see Biddle, "Early Renaissance", p. 263-281.

[42] Flower was the King's glazier and of Flemish origins; he worked in association with Fox on a number of commissions and his work favoured northern renaissance details and stylistic approach. For further details see Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England during the Middles Ages*, London, 1993, p. 212-13; and Smith, "As my Lord of Winchester shal devise", p. 43-45.

[43] Luxford, *English Benedictine Monasteries*, p. 60-61 and note 76.

[44] Biddle, "Early Renaissance", p. 257-304.

[45] For example see Dobson, "Two Ecclesiastical Patrons", p. 236.

that his humanist leanings are best seen in his artistic and educational, as opposed to architectural, patronage may tell us something of the inherent differences in architectural and artistic precedent by the second decade of the sixteenth century.

It is always easy to reinforce the grandiose and progressive elements of such a comprehensive scheme as Fox's. Fox was indeed a zealous religious reformer, and after his withdrawal from court in 1516 he focused on improving the religious houses of his dioceses, especially the religious houses, whose lack of discipline he deplored. In this respect, and in the way in which he adopted contemporary attitudes to salvation, he was relatively orthodox. This religious orthodoxy is witnessed by the inclusion of a cadaver in his chantry chapel. A fashion for cadavers had been led in England by bishops, and it tended to be associated with orthodox men (and women) of variously religious and secular occupation with high status in the fifteenth century.[46] Where we may too often perceive a stark contrast between the humble and the grandiose, they represent Fox's work of preparing for death and together result in an act of triumphant meeting with Christ.

Conclusions

On arrival at Winchester Fox initiated a campaign of rebuilding, carried out between 1503 and circa 1518 that involved a substantial reconstruction of the presbytery. Part of this single concept was his chapel which followed on directly, being completed before 1518. Contemporaneous with the chapel, the other half of his institutional memorial in the form of his college, was established. The complex and often undocumented works in the presbytery, therefore, are part of a complete scheme by Fox to create a setting for his everlasting memorial. Through this planned scheme he prioritised his commemoration and its association with the most important part of the building shortly after his arrival in Winchester. His intention to do more was presumably curtailed by the expense of Corpus, and its focus on areas peripheral to this commemorative entity presumably resulted in it being secondary in his aims to the completion of his personal memorials and foundations.

His works aimed for visual consistency where it was felt it mattered, an ambition that belies a simple aesthetic approach. However, the complexity of the relationship between the new works and the old within the cathedral have led to fragmented interpretations throughout nineteenth and twentieth century literature.

Whilst the nature of analysis may focus on aesthetics to demonstrate consistency, what Fox's work at Winchester does is demonstrate his understanding of decorum and appropriateness. Fox achieved a subtle interweaving of the contemporary with the past, indicative of his sensitivity to the character of the community and the building at Winchester, as well as the importance this signified for his own status. Moreover that this dynamic could be successfully expressed by emulating architectural works of over a hundred years earlier betrays the flexible nature of Perpendicular architecture and its interpretations.

This bridging of antiquity and established traditions with the contemporary and forward-looking is one witnessed both in his patronage and his theology. As Brian Collett has suggested, on

[46] See for example Pamela Marshall King, "Contexts of the Cadaver Tomb in England", unpublished thesis, University of York, 1987.

[47] This is an extract from a draft chapter by Brian Collett on his forthcoming book on Bishop Fox. I am extremely grateful to him for so generously providing text from his first chapter.

the one hand "he foreshadowed Luther's insistence that judgment was not a divine forensic judgment in which God rewarded good works and punished bad works, but was entirely a gift of love and grace, gratuitous and unmerited [...] yet unlike Luther, Fox believed that neither God's absolute gift of salvation nor man's good works denied each other".[47]

His chantry chapel, usually the focus for a discussion of his commemoration, should be seen as but one part of his preparation for death. Cumulatively his works, greater in scope than this paper can address, show the compatibilities of his orthodoxy with his reforming intellectual and spiritual zeal, all contributing towards his personal salvation. Getting his own house in order was, in the end, a multi-faceted campaign that occupied the last twenty-seven years of his life.

Why did Peter Parler Come to England?

Christopher Wilson

As everyone who knows his work is aware, Paul Crossley possesses a truly encyclopaedic knowledge of the literature on Gothic architecture, and for that reason I am certain that it will take him barely a nanosecond to realise that the title of this offering echoes that of Viktor Kotrba's 1969 paper "Wann kam Peter Parler nach Prag?".[1] Paul's bibliographical mastery is a consequence of his deep and long-standing interest in the historiography of art and architecture, but it is also a manifestation of two of his virtues as a man and as a scholar, namely his even-handedness and his internationalism. I have a very particular reason to be conscious of the exceptional nature of those qualities, for Paul is the only specialist in the Late Medieval architecture of Central Europe whose publications acknowledge that he has read and reflected on my own modest contributions to the topic of Peter Parler's English sources.[2] I should confess straight away that it is with the aim of grabbing from Paul's fellow students of German Late Gothic a little more attention than they have so far seen fit to bestow on my previous incursions into their domain that I have devised a title which teasingly implies that a theory some of them appear to feel is a slur on the greatness of their hero is a clearly ascertainable fact. Of course a sojourn in England is not a fact in the sense that it is attested by written evidence, but in the article of 2003 which announced his Damascene conversion to the idea of Parler's indebtedness to early fourteenth-century English Decorated architecture Paul convincingly established the very important point that because some of the adoptive Bohemian's anglicisms concern complex features which would have been extremely difficult to convey using the conventions of Late Medieval architectural drawing their presence in Prague Cathedral is most readily explicable as the result of first-hand examination of their English antecedents.[3] Before addressing the fundamental yet curiously neglected question of *why* Parler should have been moved to make a study of recent English Gothic I shall review the aspects of his work on the cathedral which demand to be explained as the fruits of a journey to England, in the process adding some more examples of such indebtedness to the substantial crop already garnered by earlier scholars. In the interests of brevity, I focus on the upper storeys of the choir. Built from circa 1373 and completed by 1385 this is Parler's latest work at Prague and arguably his masterpiece.

I start with the high vault, the part of the choir whose dependence on English sources seems most obvious (Fig. 1). It is a rib vault but its three-dimensional form is remote from that of the standard type, the quadripartite vault, for it is a tunnel interrupted by lateral penetrations in the form of fragmentary transverse tunnels. The relative lowness of these penetrations enables the main tunnel to carry a wide and continuous band of patterning which extends through the middle of all five rectangular-plan compartments and thereby generates a strongly longitudinal emphasis within the vault and the entire

[1] Viktor Kotrba, "Wann kam Peter Parler nach Prag? Zu den Anfängen der Parlerhütte in Böhmen", in *Actes du XXIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art tenu à Budapest, 1970*, vol. 1, Budapest, 1972, p. 507-520, itself echoing the title of a paper of 1929 (*ibidem*, p. 513, note 38).

[2] Christopher Wilson, *The Gothic Cathedral. The Architecture of the Great Church 1130-1530*, revised edition, London, 1992, p. 227-232, a partial reworking of the account of Prague's English-derived elements contained in the original 1990 edition. Several of this work's original observations regarding Parler's sources have been adopted without acknowledgement by writers who were presumably misled by the book's want of notes - a feature unilaterally imposed by the publisher - into supposing it to be a compilation of received ideas.

[3] Paul Crossley, "Peter Parler and England. A Problem Revisited", in *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, 64, 2003, p. 53-82 at p. 60-61, 67. This article makes reference to virtually all of the relevant literature on the English buildings discussed in the present paper.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100133

Fig. 1. Prague Cathedral, choir, vault and upper storeys of north side (photo Christopher Wilson)

upper region of the choir. The patterning consists of alternately large and small diamonds, figures whose definition by diagonals makes them the perfect means of avoiding the compartmentalised quality inherent in sequences of ordinary quadripartite vaults bounded by transverse ribs. Because the larger diamonds straddle adjacent compartments they serve to draw attention to what can be read as a chain of still larger interlocking diamonds encompassing the whole surface of the main longitudinal tunnel.

In 1959 and 1961 respectively, Nikolaus Pevsner and his protégé Henning Bock demonstrated that the high vault's three-dimensional form as well as its bay-softening longitudinal patterning derived from the extensive series of similar vaults built in south-west England during the early fourteenth century (Figs 2 and 3). Rather more explicitly than Pevsner, Bock spelled out that the concept of the patterned tunnel vault incorporating low lateral penetrations was unprecedented in continental Late Gothic architecture.[4] Pevsner and Bock were both seeking to rebut the view expressed in Karl Heinz Clasen's 1958 monograph *Deutsche Gewölbe der Spätgotik* that the Prague high vault showed no evidence of direct English influence and that its unique form was explicable as the outcome of a formal

[4] Nikolaus Pevsner, review of Karl Heinz Clasen, *Deutsche Gewölbe der Spätgotik*, Berlin, 1958, in *Art Bulletin*, 41, 1959, p. 333-336 at p. 335; Henning Bock, "Der Beginn spätgotischer Architektur in Prag (Peter Parler) und die Beziehungen zu England", in *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, 23, 1961, p. 191-210 at p. 202-203.

[5] Clasen, *Deutsche Gewölbe der Spätgotik*, p. 67-68, where he claims that the choir vault grew out of the design of that installed earlier by Parler over the Wenceslas Chapel south of the choir. However, the latter's three-dimensional form, a domical vault with penetrations unprecedented in the Empire, can readily be seen as a simplified version of the Lady Chapel vault at Wells Cathedral. Since Clasen asks rhetorically (*ibidem*, p. 67, note 45) where in England or its sphere of influence there was a triradial-based vault comparable to the Prague high vault it is evident that he was unaware of Ottery St Mary.

Fig. 2. Wells Cathedral, choir, vault and upper storeys of north side (photo Christopher Wilson)

Fig. 3. Ottery St Mary Collegiate Church, Lady Chapel (drawings by Vincent Hooper, 1904, *Architectural Association Sketchbook*, 3rd series, IX, 1905, plates 32 (longitudinal section and plans), 33 (cross-section), montage and reinforcement of ribs of Lady Chapel and screen by Christopher Wilson)

evolution internal to Parler's work on the cathedral from 1356.[5] The study of English Decorated architecture published in 1979 by Jean Bony endorsed the Pevsner-Bock view with a degree of enthusiasm which soon provoked a reaction in the form of Paul Crossley's 1981 article "Wells, the West Country, and Central European Late Gothic".[6] That paper, although it declined to engage with Bock's key point that recent precedents for the three-dimensional form of Prague's high vault existed only in England,[7] offered detailed arguments against most of the specific instances of indebtedness identified by Bock, Pevsner and Bony. Judging from its frequent citation in the German literature, the 1981 article has served to reinforce the dismissive attitude towards the idea of English influence on Parler that has predominated in German scholarship ever since the publication of Clasen's book. It is still the case that

[6] Jean Bony, *The English Decorated Style. Gothic Architecture Transformed 1250-1350*, Oxford, 1979, p. 66; Paul Crossley, "Wells, the West Country, and Central European Late Gothic", in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Wells and Glastonbury*, ed. Nicola Coldstream & Peter Draper (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 4), Leeds, 1981, p. 81-109. The argument adduced in Crossley, "Peter Parler and England", p. 62 against deriving the three-dimensional form of the Prague high vault from early thirteenth-century Angevin "tunnel" vaults with penetrations applies with equal force to Bony's suggestion that the latter influenced south-west English Decorated vaults, for most of the Angevin vaults encompass more or less explicitly domical elements and are therefore not true tunnel vaults.

[7] Although there is a fleeting reference to Angevin "tunnel" vaults with penetrations; Crossley, "Wells, the West Country, and Central European Late Gothic", p. 95.

most German-speaking writers on the topic think that such influence is a notion which can safely be ignored or mentioned as nothing more than a vague possibility.[8] So far as I am aware, Paul's revisionist article of 2003 has not yet had any impact on the thinking of any of his fellow-specialists.

Unlike its three-dimensional form, the surface patterning of the Prague high vault has been the focus of considerable attention in the literature. Two ways of describing the process of generating the pattern have emerged (Fig. 1). The first entails looking at the plan of each compartment in isolation, when the obvious reading is as two saltire crosses which overlap so as to make what can be thought of as a single saltire consisting of parallel lines intersecting at the centre to form a diamond shape. A difficulty with this reading is that it conflicts with the rather obvious fact that Parler went to great lengths to discourage the viewing of the vault as a series of distinct compartments. It also fails to explain why the east and west limits of each compartment are partly bounded by ribs and partly not. The other interpretation, first proposed by Erich Bachmann in 1939, is to see the pattern as a series of large Y-shapes or triradials extending right across the central vessel.[9] The uprights of the Ys correspond to the incomplete transverse ribs and their arms correspond to the ribs which link up to alternate springings on the opposite side. The outer extremities of the arms relate to the springings in exactly the same way as conventional diagonal ribs do, although of course they cannot be classified as diagonal ribs because they do not extend the whole distance between diagonally opposite corners of single compartments. In my view this reading is far more compelling than that of overlapping saltires because, unlike the latter, it offers a comprehensive account and one which accords with Parler's fundamental aim of breaking down the compartmentalised character of traditional quadripartite vaulting. The strongest possible confirmation that Parler thought of the pattern in the choir's rectangular-plan bays as being built up from intersecting triradials is the use of the same idea in the other part of the high vault, that over the hemicycle, where the uprights of the Ys are arranged radially.

Triradials used as an autonomous motif, i.e. not enclosed within the triangular configurations of bounding ribs found in virtually all the Early and High Gothic examples, were practically the hallmark of enterprising German vault design in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, but the Prague high vault's intersecting triradials are the earliest anywhere on the Continent. Triradials were seldom used as the basis of vault design in thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century England, and effectively the only ambitious English vault which anticipates Prague's intersecting examples is that which covers the Lady Chapel of the collegiate church of Ottery St Mary in Devon.[10] Presumably begun when the college was founded in 1337, the church at Ottery can be attributed to William Joy (*floruit* 1329-1347)

[8] Honourable exceptions are Norbert Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, New Haven & London, 2000, p. 131, and Norbert Nussbaum & Sabine Lepsky, *Das gotische Gewölbe*, Munich & Berlin, 1999, p. 231, 367, n. 831. Unfortunately, the only extended discussion of possible English sources for Parler's work to be published in Germany since the 1960s, that in Barbara Baumüller, *Der Chor des Veitsdomes in Prag. Die Königskirche Kaiser Karls IV*, Berlin, 1984, p. 95-103, is very weak.

[9] Erich Bachmann, "Zu einer Analyse des Prager Veitsdomes", in *Studien zur Peter Parler*, ed. Karl M. Swoboda & Erich Bachmann (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kunst im Sudeten- und Karpathenraum, 2*)*, Brno & Leipzig, 1939, p. 26-67 at p. 36, 39. Bachmann was the first of several scholars to compare the overlapping parallel saltires of Prague's high vault with that of the timber high vault over the nave of York Minster, under construction in January 1356. However, the York vault is an unlikely source, for not only is it uncomfortably late in relation to Parler's advent at Prague but its saltires, unlike their counterparts at Prague, are irregular, are not connected to the springings and, when viewed from the floor, are rendered effectively unrecognisable as entities by their application to the discontinuous surfaces of a conventional quadripartite vault. Nothing in Parler's œuvre suggests a knowledge of northern English buildings.

[10] For the thirteenth-century examples of vaults based on unenclosed triradials in the British Isles see Christopher Wilson, "The Stellar Vaults of Glasgow Cathedral's Inner Crypt and Villard de Honnecourt's Chapter-House Plan: A Conundrum Revisited", in *Medieval Art and Architecture in the Diocese of Glasgow*, ed. Richard Fawcett (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 23), Leeds, 1999, p. 55-76. For a short account of these and of the vaults based on intersecting triradials see Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 229-230.

on stylistic grounds which include the strong likeness of the grid of cusped diamonds running the length of the Lady Chapel's vault to the all-over patterning of the vault that Joy installed above the presbytery and choir of Wells Cathedral circa 1336 (Figs 2 and 3, lower right).[11] The Lady Chapel vault includes other ribs besides intersecting triradials, but as if to signal the latter's special status as the conceptual matrix of the design, Joy installed within the screen at the entrance to the chapel three small tunnel vaults with penetrations whose ribs consist of no more than two opposed intersecting triradials spanning each compartment (Fig. 3, lower left). To turn the pattern of the main chapel vault into that of the screen vaults one has to do no more than take out all the diagonal ribs which extend over two compartments. Since the resulting pattern can accommodate penetrations only on its east and west sides, the main tunnel in each of the screen's vaults has to be aligned north-south rather than east-west. The pattern of one screen vault can be converted into that of two compartments of the Prague high vault simply by doubling the number of triradials on the longitudinal axis. The screen vault pattern is only one among several designed by Joy which resemble Prague in having a single diamond at the centre of each compartment. The central diamonds in Joy's vaults are invariably cusped, but Parler never showed any inclination to follow the south-west English tendency to treat vaults as a specialised form of tracery. Indeed Parler's interiors make what is by English standards a very sparing use of architectural embellishment and to that extent they keep faith with French Rayonnant aesthetics.

The most compelling evidence yielded by the vault of the Ottery Lady Chapel that Parler had personally travelled to south-west England concerns its three-dimensional form rather than its surface patterning. The main longitudinal tunnel is unique among early fourteenth-century English vaults in being of semicircular transverse section despite being bounded at its east and west ends by obtusely pointed arches, elements whose inclusion necessitated some inconspicuous juggling of the extremities of the tunnel (Fig. 3, upper left). The semicircular profile of the tunnel can be understood as Joy's rather radical solution to an aesthetic problem which had arisen in his earlier choir vault at Wells. There the crease-like ridges of the pointed longitudinal and transverse tunnels give to the hexagonal compartments that they bisect a character which is at odds with the single planes found in all the vault's many other small compartments (Fig. 2). The Ottery solution was evidently approved of by Parler, who adopted its semicircular profile for the longitudinal tunnel at Prague and also finessed its junction with the conventionally pointed east arch of the crossing. It is unlikely that Parler would have noted and reproduced these singularities of the Ottery Lady Chapel vault if he had known the building only

[11] The likeness between the high choir vaults of Wells and Ottery is even stronger. For an unknown period before 1329 William Joy had worked, presumably as warden, under the master mason of Wells Cathedral, Thomas of Witney. The documentary evidence of the careers of both men is presented in John Harvey, "The Building of Wells Cathedral, II: 1307-1508", in *Wells Cathedral. A History*, ed. Linzee S. Colchester, p. 79-85, 87, 89; John Harvey, *English Mediaeval Architects. A Biographical Dictionary down to 1550*, 2nd edition, Gloucester, 1984, p. 164-165 and p. 338-341. For the scanty documentary evidence of the building history of the early fourteenth-century eastern arm at Wells see Tim Ayers, *The Medieval Stained Glass of Wells Cathedral* (Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, Great Britain, 4), Oxford, 2004, p. 3-4, p. 137-140 and p. 283-287.

[12] The ambitious if somewhat crudely realised early fourteenth-century tunnel vault over the chancel of the parish church of Urchfont, Wiltshire (Bony, *English Decorated*, plate 294), seems at first sight to be of semicircular transverse section but is in actuality three-centred. The two westernmost compartments of the high vault of the Prague choir are nineteenth-century replacements for the originals destroyed in the bombardment of 1757. The high vaults of the choir and nave at Ottery St Mary are tunnels of pointed section like that in the Wells choir, but their ridges are rendered much less conspicuous than the latter by being given a rounded profile. The strange "split" bosses at Ottery and Wells (which seem to have made their first appearance in the presbytery of St Augustine's Abbey in Bristol, now Bristol Cathedral, shortly after 1300) may reasonably be regarded as further indications of personal inspection by Parler, for in drawings they would probably not have stood out clearly enough to have attracted Parler's attention as a motif worthy of imitation (Figs 1 and 2); Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 230. The similar bosses formerly on the wooden vault of the Hansasaal in the Cologne Town Hall were late nineteenth-century and not based on evidence of the vault installed after fire damage in 1349.

Fig. 4 Meissen Cathedral, Fürstenkapelle, vault. Above: as existing. Below: with the "appliqué" tracery elements suppressed, the ribs joined up and Ottery St Mary-style cusping added (photo Jeffrey West, drawing Christopher Wilson)

Fig. 5 Prague Cathedral, choir, exterior of north clearstorey (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg)

through architectural drawings, for the extant late medieval drawings of specific vaults hardly ever show more than a horizontal projection of rib patterns.[12]

Confirmation of the thesis that Parler possessed a very detailed knowledge of the Lady Chapel vault at Ottery St Mary comes from an unexpected quarter. It has long been realised that a series of ambitious chapels and choirs built in Upper Saxony during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries was strongly influenced by the now largely destroyed chapel of All Saints which Parler began to erect next to the palace block in Prague Castle circa 1370, only a year or two before he will have had to start to formulate his definitive design for the upper parts of the nearby cathedral choir. One of the earlier Saxon chapels, the "Fürstenkapelle" added circa 1423-1428 to the west end of Meissen Cathedral, is covered by a tunnel vault with penetrations which ranks as one of Germany's oldest examples of tracery-decorated vaulting (Fig. 4, above).[13] If one completes graphically or in imagination the rib pattern on the main longitudinal tunnel, where ribs proper give way to strange "appliqué" tracery motifs, the result is a virtually exact replica of the Ottery vault (Fig. 4, below). Restoring the "missing" ribs also suggests that Ottery's grid of cusped diamonds might have been used as the point of departure

[13] Elisabeth Hütter, Günter Kavacs, Michael Kisten & Heinrich Magirius, *Das Portal an der Westturmfront und die Fürstenkapelle* (Forschungen zur Bau- und Kunstgeschichte des Meissner Domes, 2), Halle an der Saale, 1999, p. 227. The possibility of English influence is dismissed in two short sentences (*ibidem*, p. 247). For the All Saints Chapel in Prague Castle see most recently Paul Crossley, "Our Lady of Nuremberg, All Saints Chapel in Prague, and the High Choir of Prague Cathedral", in *Prague and Bohemia. Medieval Art, Architecture and Cultural Exchange in Central Europe*, ed. Zoë Opačić (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 32), Leeds, 2009, p. 64-80, at p.73-76.

for Meissen's tracery motifs. There must be a possibility that the Meissen vault was modelled on the long-lost and unrecorded vault over the All Saints Chapel at Prague, but an alternative explanation for its resemblance to the Ottery vault would be that some time before the closure of the Prague masons' lodge at the onset of the Hussite wars in 1419 the designer had seen there a drawing or drawings of Ottery which Parler had left behind at his death in 1399. The exiguous remains of All Saints still in place today include parts of a dado consisting of a continuously moulded and cusped arcade, each of which opens into shallow and plainly treated niches of segmental plan. So far as I am aware, the only other fourteenth-century earlier examples of such simply detailed and shallow niches are those in the sedilia of the Ottery Lady Chapel, although there they are compressed half-octagons in plan (Fig. 3, upper right and lower left).[14]

As is well known, the high vault of Prague Cathedral's choir engendered numerous "net-vaults" throughout Central Europe, but there was never any prospect that the equally innovatory three-storey main elevations would exert important influences in an architectural culture where much simpler types of elevation had long predominated and would continue to do so. Prague's elevations differ from the high vault not only in their posterity but in the nature and extent of their use of ideas drawn from Decorated architecture, for the English-derived elements of the clearstorey and triforium are integrated into a design whose fundamentals conform to the conventions of the Rayonnant great church (Fig. 1). The essentially Rayonnant format of Parler's elevations is no more than what one would expect from a German-born architect charged with the rebuilding of a cathedral, for the Empire's very few examples of Gothic great church architecture - Cologne and Regensburg Cathedrals and the naves at Strasbourg and Metz Cathedrals - had all followed mid-thirteenth-century French precedent closely. At Prague such an orientation was in any case more or less inevitable, given that Parler's work there was in the nature of a completion of the choir begun by his French-born predecessor, Matthew of Arras. However, in the choir's western bays, which Arras had not begun, Parler showed himself a more traditional practitioner of the Rayonnant idiom than his predecessor, for there he abandoned the latter's very slender vault responds in favour of boldly projecting responds which look like a deliberate harking back to a feature found in most thirteenth-century French great churches and in all the German Rayonnant cathedrals (Fig. 1, left). The strength of the bay divisions engendered by Parler's massive vault shafts might seem at odds with the bay-softening aspect of his high vault, but just such a combination of strongly vertical-emphasising responds with a vault of markedly longitudinal emphasis had been used by William Joy in the main vessel of the eastern arm at Wells Cathedral (Fig. 2).[15]

The wall structure of the upper storeys at Prague is a brilliantly compelling fusion of English- and French-derived elements which would probably have seemed totally irreconcilable to anyone but Parler. The clearstorey consists of thin sheets of tracery and glass filling virtually all the available space under and between the vault and its responds. On the exterior of these great windows, at the level of their sills, runs a walkway whose floor forms the ceiling of another walkway (Fig. 6). The lower walk-

[14] The only thirteenth-century examples I know are those flanking the north transept portal of Notre-Dame in Paris, built in the early or mid-1240s.

[15] This combination is foreshadowed even more strikingly in the presbytery of St Peter's Abbey, Gloucester (now Gloucester Cathedral). Although Gloucester was one of the outstanding centres of English architecture during the second and third quarters of the fourteenth century, there is nothing at Prague which can with confidence be attributed to its influence. Admittedly the foliage-less Rayonnant bell capitals in the south transept at Gloucester are remarkably similar to those used by Parler throughout the Prague choir, but there are alternative German sources, including the capitals of circa 1300 in the lateral chapels of the choir of Regensburg Cathedral. The idea of using bell capitals, though not the exact form adopted by Parler, was obviously due to the influence of Matthew of Arras's work on the choir; Marc Carel Schurr, *Baukunst Peter Parlers*, Ostfildern, 2003, p. 58, ill. 48.

Fig. 6 St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster Palace, lower chapel, south elevation of easternmost bays (Frederick Mackenzie, *The Architectural Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of St Stephen, Westminster*, London, 1844, plate 7, detail).

way passes behind the arcade of the triforium and is made part of the interior volume of the church by virtue of being enclosed within a second small arcade which is glazed. All of these elements are standard in French Rayonnant great churches. What is quite unprecedented in either French or German Rayonnant is the presence of a further walkway in front of the triforium arcade (Fig. 1). The inclusion of this feature is only made possible by the utterly un-Rayonnant treatment of the lower two-thirds of the combined upper storeys as a series of shallow recesses with canted sides set at an obtuse angle to the main plane of the elevation. Clearstoreys whose windows are set at the back of recesses were commonplace in England, but the only earlier main elevations anywhere in Europe which incorporate recesses with wide and obtusely angled splays comparable to those at Prague are to be found in the presbytery of Wells Cathedral, built in the early 1330s by William Joy (Fig. 2).[16] Here, just as at Prague, the recesses are continued down into the triforium zone, although that fact is likely to have been noticed only by "professional" observers since the attention of most viewers will inevitably have been drawn to the richly treated stone screens which occupy the front plane of the triforium, the role of which, uniquely in the main elevations of an English great church, was to contain a series of standing images, probably Apostles and prophets. That the downwards extensions of the recesses were the only feature of the Wells triforium imitated at Prague is not at all surprising, for Parler's fidelity to the basic format of the Rayonnant great church will have made him highly resistant to the English tradition of lavishly enriched middle storeys. The same factor will have ruled out any thought of imitating the relative lowness of the Wells clearstorey, but the detailing was quite another matter and Henning Bock was surely right to see the unique arched doorways opening through the splays of the

[16] Earlier examples of this feature are to be found in the aisle windows of Westminster Abbey, in the main room of the chapter house at York Minster, and, most importantly, in the aisle windows of the choir at Saint Augustine's Abbey, Bristol. The existence of these examples makes it hard to understand why the Wells clearstorey passages are characterised as "insular variants of the rémois passage" in Baumüller, *Chor des Veitsdomes in Prag*, p. 98.

recesses as a major influence on the celebrated arch-topped panels which project obliquely from both the exterior and the interior of the outermost lights of Prague's clearstorey windows. The Wells doorways anticipate Prague's panels in their aedicule-like framing and general prominence, their setting at a very obtuse angle, the interruption they cause to the mouldings enclosing the windows, and their ogee terminations incorporating big, freestanding finials.[17] The only earlier English building whose wall passage entrances are ornamented in any way is the choir of St Augustine's Abbey at Bristol (now Bristol Cathedral), the South-West's most important Decorated work of circa 1300 and a major influence on the detailing of the eastern arm at Wells. As Henning Bock was again the first to show, the anonymous busts surmounting the entrances to the aisle wall passages at Bristol are the only real precursors of the infinitely more famous portrait busts set over the doors to the triforium wall passage entrances at Prague.[18]

It is unlikely to have been mere coincidence that the settings of the canted aedicules in the clearstoreys at Prague and Wells are in both cases the interstices left between large arches enclosing narrower arches. The source of the quite complex arch form used for the heads of the Wells aedicules was the series of blind arches decorating the jambs of the lateral windows in the upper chapel at St Stephen's Chapel, Westminster, and there can be little doubt that the remarkable "window within window" treatment of the Wells clearstorey elevations derived from another component of St Stephen's, namely the lateral windows of the lower chapel (Figs 2 and 6). If a full set of the designs of St Stephen's had been available to Joy that would not be at all surprising, for this exceptionally sumptuously treated building was the fountainhead of the mature Decorated style as a whole and its influence is palpable elsewhere in the main elevations at Wells. Moreover, the accounts which cover the first year of the chapel's construction, 1292-1293, contain the earliest known reference to Thomas of Witney, under whom Joy worked at Wells before succeeding him as the cathedral's master mason in 1329. Had Parler been able to inspect at Wells a drawing of the elevations of the lower chapel at Westminster that would account for the fact that the latter shares with Prague but not with Wells its setting of the apices of the inner and outer arches at the same level and its treatment of the entire design as glazed tracery occupying a single plane (Figs 1, 2 and 6).[19]

[17] Bock, "Der Beginn spätgotischer Architektur", p. 198 and p. 200-201; Crossley, "Peter Parler and England", p. 69-72. At Prague a crocketted hoodmould cuts across the window jambs, but at Wells the interruption caused to the rear arches of the clearstorey windows is more apparent than real, because the innermost mouldings of the rear arches are made to seem deeper than the outer jambs of the doorways by the shadows cast by the strange forwards-projecting strips of masonry which occupy the splays. The doorways in the clearstorey jambs of the choir of Selby Abbey are simpler and later than those at Wells and are likely to derive from them.

[18] Bock, "Der Beginn spätgotischer Architektur", p. 200, note 21. Adumbrations of the Bristol busts are to be found at Saint-Denis (Sumner McKnight Crosby, *L'Abbaye Royale de Saint-Denis*, Paris, 1953, fig. 69) and Sées (Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 231, ill. 2). The inverted arches in the parapet of the south transept façade at Prague, the largest of which perches above the apex of the window arch below, recall nothing in earlier Gothic so much as the strainer arches inserted under the crossing at Wells circa 1340, themselves almost certainly modelled on the inverted and upright arches in the sedilia of circa 1300 in the Lady Chapel of St Augustine's Abbey, Bristol; Gerald Cobb, *English Cathedrals. The Forgotten Centuries*, London, 1980, ills 3, 57, 58. Although the Prague parapet was set up a few years after Parler's death in 1399, it is likely to conform to his intentions because its easternmost margin is taken account of in the design of the adjacent openwork staircase, the heraldry of which was being painted in 1372.

[19] For the small arches decorating the jambs of the upper chapel windows at St Stephen's, and for the wall arcade on which the screens of the Wells triforium are based, see Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 202, ills 140, 141. A possible alternative source for the "window within a window" motif is León Cathedral (*ibidem*, p. 231, ill. 118), but there the device is not used as it is at Prague and in the English examples, i.e. as a means of ensuring that the tracery in the lateral windows and the chevet all springs from one level. Moreover, it does not share with Prague and St Stephen's the use of stilted arches for the heads of the "windows within". For Thomas of Witney at St Stephen's Chapel see Harvey, *English Mediaeval Architects*, p. 339.

Fig. 7.Wells Cathedral, choir, exterior of south clearstorey (photo Christopher Wilson)

One of the best pieces of evidence that Parler had the opportunity to study the presbytery of Wells Cathedral at first hand and at close quarters is provided by a detail whose relative inconspicuousness has ensured that it has not so far attracted the attention of architectural historians. The detail in question, the vertically discontinuous treatment of the external clearstorey jambs, whose simply splayed lower parts bear no relation to the moulded profile used in the upper parts (Fig. 7), appears to be the only anticipation in earlier Gothic architecture of the way in which the diagonal planes of Prague's angled aedicules contradict the essentially orthogonal recession of the main parts of the clearstorey jambs above them (Figs 1 and 5). Besides flouting the expectations of the ultra-attentive viewer, the splayed lower parts of the external jambs at Wells fulfil a practical role, for their greater bulk vis-à-vis the upper jambs enables them to help accommodate a further peculiarity of the clearstorey passages, which is that they take a series of wide outwards "detours" as they pass behind the responds of the high vault. Each of the detours is in plan four sides of an irregular octagon and their purpose was doubtless to leave buttress-like masses of masonry that would enhance the capacity of the clearstorey wall piers to resist the outwards thrusts exerted by the high vault. Passages of this kind had had a long if sporadic history but none of the earlier examples resembles Wells in being expressed externally. Far from attempting to conceal or play down his bizarre treatment of the external jambs, William Joy drew attention to it by marking the boundary between the two levels with prominent foliate finials. He set these flourishes at precisely the same level as the finials surmounting the doors which lead into the clearstorey passages (Figs 2, 7), thereby giving to the external and internal manifestations of the passages' presence an important measure of equivalence. Parler was evidently fascinated by that equivalence, for he chose to enhance it by treating the analogous features at Prague, the angled aedicules, as mirror images of one another which are exact in all respects apart from the glazing of those on the interior and the openness of those on the exterior (Figs 1 and 5). Unlike Joy's outwards detours from the internal walkways, Parler's detours go inwards from the external walkways towards passages which (until they were blocked in modern times) cut straight through the clearstorey wall piers at points where one would expect to find the lowest parts of the window jambs. These differences highlight something which it is important not to lose sight of when considering the English-derived components of the main elevations at Prague: the upper storeys at Wells were only Parler's point of departure in the formulation of his own no less complex and self-consciously original design.

Among the most arresting features of the canted aedicules in the Prague clearstorey is the way in which the front edges of their sills and the mouldings under them are made to interrupt the high vault responds (Fig. 1). Until recently this was generally regarded as a clear-cut case of borrowing from the choir of the Heiligkreuzkirche in Schwäbisch Gmünd, where Parler was working at the time of his summons to Prague in 1356. However, in 2001 Marc Schurr proposed that the much heavier moulding set some way below the clearstorey sills at Gmünd is a revision made to the original design during the 1370s and that it therefore postdates by a small margin the drawing up of designs for the Prague upper choir.[20] Such a reversal of the previously accepted relative chronology would help explain the rather inconsequential quality of the moulding at Gmünd and its lack of any larger aesthetic role comparable to that fulfilled by its near-analogue at Prague, which not only underscores the high vault's longitudinal emphasis but also participates in a horizontal-vertical dialectic played out in the upper choir generally. If Schurr's redating is valid, it would seem that the only adumbrations of Prague's shaft-interrupting sills are to be found in the lantern of the crossing tower built circa 1310 at Pershore Abbey

[20] Schurr, *Baukunst Peter Parlers*, p. 111; Marc Carel Schurr, "Heinrich und Peter Parler am Heiligkreuzmünster in Schwäbisch Gmünd", in *Parlerbauten: Architektur, Skulptur, Restaurierung. Internationales Parler-Symposium, Schwäbisch Gmünd 17.-19. Juli 2001*, ed. Richard Strobel & Annette Siefert (Arbeitsheft 13, Landesdenkmalamt Baden-Württemberg), Stuttgart, 2004, p. 29-38 at p. 35.

Fig. 8. Pershore Abbey, lantern of crossing tower, west wall (photo Christopher Wilson)

in Worcestershire (Fig. 8), where, as in the upper storeys of the Prague choir, the elevations are based on the linked upper storeys of French Rayonnant great churches.[21] The crenellated "transoms" at the base of the quasi-clearstorey in the lantern at Pershore interrupt the major uprights and form two-sided projections that anticipate the way in which the clearstorey sills in the eastern choir bays at Prague project forwards so as to sever visually the very slender vault shafts which Parler inherited from Mat-thew of Arras's part of the main arcade. Although the uprights at Pershore are not vault shafts, and the blind cusped squares forming the merlons of the crenellations are far smaller than Prague's tall angled aedicules, these differences seem insufficient to me to warrant ruling out the possibility that we have here the germ of one of the most original features of Parler's design. My only reservation about postulating influence from Pershore is that Parler's knowledge of Wells probably makes such a thesis redundant. In order to conceive Prague's respond-severing sills Parler's prodigious imaginative faculty would surely have needed no greater stimulus than the pairs of small two-sided projections which punctuate at regular intervals the miniature parapet running along the top of the triforium at Wells (Fig. 2). Admittedly these projections surmount diagonal buttresses which do not continue to a higher level,

[21] The exiguous literature on the Pershore crossing tower is reviewed in Malcolm Thurlby, "The Abbey Church, Pershore: An Architectural History", in *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 15,1996, p. 147-210 at p. 185-186, 198.

[22] Pevsner, review of Clasen, *Deutsche Gewölbe der Spätgotik*, p. 336; Nikolaus Pevsner, *An Outline of European Architecture*, 2nd edition, Harmondsworth, 1945, p. 65, the final words of the chapter entitled "The Early and Classic Gothic Style" in this and all the many subsequent editions.

but it will have been obvious to Parler from the buttresses' lack of conventional terminal pinnacles that the projections fulfilled a role which was implicitly one of curtailing or severing. It is of course perfectly possible that William Joy had based the design of the Wells triforium parapet on the crenellation of the quasi-triforium at Pershore, and if Parler had succeeded in gaining access to the tracing house at Wells it might have been in drawings kept there that he encountered the remarkable lantern of Pershore's crossing tower.

Nikolaus Pevsner's 1959 review of Clasen's book on German Gothic vaulting, the real starting point for the inquiry into Parler's English sources, ends by admitting that "we are left without any explanation why [...] Parler should have turned to England for architectural inspiration". This comment is all the more curious given Pevsner's own firm conviction that Decorated was the most innovatory architecture in late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Europe.[22] That is my view too, and I think that the premium attached to formal innovation by the major practitioners of that tradition would have held an obvious attraction for Parler, whose contributions to Prague Cathedral could hardly be more eloquent of his determination to produce architecture which was conspicuously more enterprising and varied than the refined but sober work completed to Matthew of Arras's designs.[23] However, when one considers Parler's work on the cathedral as a whole it becomes evident that over and above the individual debts evident in its novel detailing there is a more fundamental affinity with Decorated architecture. Clearly Parler conceived his additions as a series of set-pieces which would not only display to advantage his extraordinary virtuosity and imaginative range but also express the hierarchy of functions fulfilled by those parts of the cathedral; nothing else can explain the huge variations in treatment between the sacristy, the south porch, the Wenceslas Chapel and the main vessel of the choir. The deliberate pursuit of diversity within a single building is something which had no precedent in Central European or indeed continental Gothic generally, but it is one of the defining characteristics of English Decorated architecture at its most ambitious levels. The disseminator of this approach, if not its inventor, appears to have been Michael of Canterbury, whose masterpiece, St Stephen's Chapel in Westminster Palace, employed three highly contrasted modes for the interiors of the upper and lower chapels and for the exterior. On the main front of his gatehouse to Saint Augustine's Abbey in Canterbury Michael employed very similar modes on a single façade.[24] Within the genre of major church architecture, the most remarkable applications of the concept of multiple modes are the interiors of the eastern parts of Wells and Ely Cathedrals and of the abbey church of St Augustine's, Bristol. At Wells a whole gamut of devices, complex vaulting pre-eminent among them, is pressed into service to dramatise the hierarchy of spaces represented by the presbytery, the choir, the Lady Chapel, the ambulatory and the side aisles.[25] At Ely there is also a hierarchical distinction between the ultra-rich

[23] The most enterprising feature attributable to Arras (although it is sometimes attributed to a hypothetical "transitional master" in charge of the works between the death of Arras and the advent of Parler) is the provision made for a pendant vault over the sacristy. This choice is likely to have been influenced by, *inter alia*, the non-skeletonised pendant vault installed during the 1270s in the south choir sacristy at Saint-Urbain in Troyes, an example of the type which has been almost totally ignored by modern scholarship.

[24] Christopher Wilson, "The Origins of the Perpendicular Style and its Development to *circa* 1360", unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1979, p. 78-79 and passim; Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 192-194, 199-204; Robert Suckale, "Peter Parler und das Problem der Stillagen", in *Die Parler und der Schöne Stil 1350-1400*, ed. Anton Legner, vol. 4, Cologne, 1980, p. 175-183. One can only speculate as to whether an awareness of the English antecedents of the formal diversity of Parler's contributions to Prague Cathedral might have saved Suckale from espousing the curious notion that this diversity had less to do with Parler's exercise of agency than with a wish on Charles IV's part to see embodied visually the hierarchy of modes discussed by theorists of rhetoric; *ibidem*, p. 179-181. The use of varied modes has been discussed recently, as an aspect of the architect's creative work, in Marc Carel Schurr, "Peter Parler's Choir of St Bartholomew in Kolín, and the Art of 'Articulation'", in *Prague and Bohemia*, ed. Zoë Opačić , p.101-116.

[25] Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 198-203.

Fig. 9. Snettisham, parish church of St Mary, west front (photo Christopher Wilson)

encrusted quality of the three western presbytery bays and the monumentality of the stonework of the octagonal crossing housing the liturgical choir, but these sharply differentiated modes also express a measure of conformity to the characteristics of the pre-existing spaces which adjoin them, namely the very elaborately detailed early thirteenth-century eastern presbytery and the (by 14th-century standards) severely monumental Romanesque transepts and nave. At Bristol the central vessel housing the liturgical choir and presbytery possesses a quality of decorous serenity appropriate to its role, whereas the much more eye-catching features dominating the side aisles - the astonishing vaults which seem to mimic the timber roofs of secular halls, and the hardly less arresting stellar tomb recesses - can be read as celebrations of the rapidly rising fortunes of the abbey's lay patrons.

Despite the fact that Parler had grasped both the fundamental principles and much of the novel vocabulary of the strand of Decorated which grew out of St Stephen's Chapel, the focus of his interest in this tradition, to judge from the aspects of Prague Cathedral discussed so far, was remarkably narrow, for it encompassed only the eastern parts of Bristol, Wells and Ottery St Mary. If Parler had travelled to England during his Wanderjahr(e) some time in the early 1350s it could reasonably be expected that his work would yield some indication that he had been exposed to the recent architecture of other English regions besides the South-West. In fact there is one major feature of the cathedral whose only precursor in Gothic architecture is to be found in East Anglia. This is the porch of the south transept, the external architecture of which is little more than a straightforward enlargement of the unique porch on the west front of the parish church at Snettisham in Norfolk (Fig. 9). The Snettisham nave was built quickly around 1330, to all appearances to designs provided by the master mason of Ely Cathedral, John Ramsey, and the form of its west porch can with some confidence be attributed to the intervention of the lady of the manor at the time, Queen Isabelle, widow of Edward II, not least because the only other English example of triple arched west porch was that built under royal patronage in the 1280s at the Augustinian priory church at Leeds in Kent, where the adjoining castle was owned by the Queen from 1327.[26] A parish church, however impressive its architecture and however exalted its patronage, is of course not the kind of model one would expect to see being followed in the mother church of a primatial see whose patron was an emperor and whose basic format was that of a French cathedral. Nevertheless, the likeness speaks for itself. Apart from being built to almost twice the scale, the façade of the Prague porch differs from its prototype in only two important points, namely the perfectly equal width of its three open arches and the greater elaboration of the buttresses between those arches. Both porches are surmounted by an upper chamber whose existence is acknowledged only by two small lancet windows, and a further anticipation of Prague at Snettisham is the way in which the southern side wall of the interior space of the porch is canted in order to accommodate the spiral stair ascending to the right of the window lighting the main vessel, although of course at Prague

[26] The same conclusion regarding Queen Isabelle's patronage was reached independently in Richard Fawcett, "Snettisham Church", in *King's Lynn and the Fens. Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. John McNeill (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 31), Leeds, 2008, p. 134-147. For the Leeds west porch see P.J. Tester, "Excavations on the Site of Leeds Priory. Part I - The Church", in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 93, 1977, p. 33-45 at p. 42, fig. 1, where the porch and nave are misdated to the early fourteenth century. The evidence of style indicates that the nave was built shortly after the acquisition of Leeds Castle by Queen Eleanor of Castile in 1278, and later documentary evidence indicates that this was a royal benefaction, a circumstance which will have been of interest to Queen Isabelle after her own acquisition of the castle in 1327. The Leeds porch resembled that at Prague in being entered through three arches of equal span but differed from Prague and Snettisham in being flanked by rooms of rectangular plan. Leeds and Snettisham may have been offshoots from the Cistercian tradition of west porches represented in the late thirteenth century by examples at Tintern in Monmouthshire and Neath in Glamorgan, although these differed in projecting well beyond the buttresses of the west front. In so far as it is possible to judge, given that Leeds and the Cistercian examples have been demolished almost to ground level, Snettisham is much the closest in form to Prague.

both side walls are canted. Yet despite their extent and importance, the likenesses between the two porches are such that they could perfectly well have been the outcome of studying drawings of Snettisham's west front rather than of examining it at first hand.[27] That this is how Parler got to know about the design of Snettisham is a real possibility. The west front of Ottery St Mary possesses a porch which is the only one in England to share Snettisham's overall form of a "lean-to" set between buttresses projecting westwards from the corners of the main vessel (Figs 9 and 10), and the resemblance will not have been fortuitous, since Ottery incorporates several features indicative of a detailed knowledge of the work of the royal master mason William Ramsey, who was almost certainly the son of John Ramsey, and drawings showing some of the works of those major architects are very likely to have been kept in the tracing house at Ottery or that at Wells.[28] William Joy's west portal at Ottery is highly important in relation to Prague not merely because it shares the latter's dependence on Snettisham but because it appears to be the only possible source in earlier Gothic architecture for the Prague south portal's combination of twin doors and canted side walls.[29] Besides being the means whereby some of Joy's complex creative processes could be grasped by Parler, access to an archive of drawings kept at Ottery or Wells will probably have helped spur this most ambitious artistic mind towards attaining in his own endeavours a level of sophistication and originality comparable to that already reached by the leading English architects of the early fourteenth century.

What then is the most likely explanation for the fact that the whole of Parler's knowledge of English Decorated architecture seems to have been acquired in the course of a journey centred on Bristol, Wells and Ottery St Mary? One possibility would be to argue simply that in his Wanderjahr Parler developed a liking for the works of the anonymous Bristol Master and those of Thomas of Witney and William Joy, a taste which did not extend to early fourteenth-century English architecture as a whole. If Parler's main interest was vaulting, and particularly if he had somehow got wind of the fact that in the early 1350s the South-West's spectacular achievements in that field were beginning to be influential in other parts of England, Witney and Joy's work will have been a natural goal.[30] But there is at least one other way of making sense of the evidence. This involves postulating that Parler had been invited to continue the works of Prague Cathedral a little before 1356, perhaps during the Emperor Charles IV's German progress of 1353-1354, and that as soon as he received his commission he began to inquire which were the recent works of great church architecture with most to offer as exemplars for the principal task before him, namely the reworking of the design of the cathedral's main vessels.[31] As was noted earlier, Parler will have been well aware of the Empire's handful of Rayonnant-style great

[27] If, as is all but certain, the concept of lighting the south transept terminal wall with a single large window of upright format was an integral part of Parler's designs *ab initio* (see note 18 above), that would serve to reinforce the basic likeness of the Prague south front to the Snettisham west front.

[28] On the basis of evidence unknown to me until recently, I no longer accept the suggestion made in Wilson, "Origins of the Perpendicular Style", p. 349 that the father of Master William Ramsey is likely to have been the William Ramsey senior mentioned in a document of 1331.

[29] The pulpitum of St Paul's Cathedral, London (complete by 1327) anticipated the canted sides of the Ottery porch but not its twin entrance; Wilson, "Origins of the Perpendicular Style", p. 108, 203, ill. 227.

[30] Vaults built in the early 1350s and more or less closely based on earlier south-western vaults: Aerary porch at St George's, Windsor; canopy of tomb of Archbishop John Stratford and porch to prior's hall at Canterbury Cathedral; chapter house and cloister vaults at the Carmelite friary, Coventry.

[31] Similarities linking major monuments of Gothic architecture separated by great distances make it all but certain that leading master masons did not necessarily have to travel in order to obtain detailed information about remotely situated buildings reputed to be of unusual interest. Inevitably, given the seemingly total dearth of documentary evidence, the problem of the long-distance exchange of drawings and other information between major lodges has been little discussed. However, see the comments in relation to German and English Gothic around 1300 in Peter Kurmann, "York und Regensburg. Zum Problem des internationalen 'style rayonnant'", in *Regnum Bohemiae et Sacrum Romanum Imperium. Sborník k pocte Jiřího Kuthana*, ed. Jan Royt, Michaela Ottová & Aleš Mudra, Prague, 2005, p. 197-209 at p. 205-206.

Fig. 10. Ottery St Mary Collegiate Church, west front (photo Christopher Wilson)

churches,[32] and he will have had little difficulty finding out, if he did not know already, that the very few major church projects begun in northern France during the early fourteenth century deviated little from paths that had become thoroughly well-trodden since the mid-thirteenth century.[33] It need not surprise us if the outcome of his researches was to uncover the fact that the choir of Wells Cathedral was by far the most imaginative and ambitious interpretation of the traditional three-storey basilican scheme produced anywhere in Europe during the early fourteenth century. Having established the utility of Wells as a model, Parler could then have embarked on the kind of highly focused fact-finding mission which some late medieval architects are known to have undertaken in preparation for starting work on a specially important project.[34] The laconic wording of the inscription painted over the portrait bust of Parler in the choir triforium at Prague, which recorded simply that he was fetched from Schwäbisch Gmünd and made master mason of Prague Cathedral by Charles IV and that he was aged twenty-three when he began to direct the works in 1356,[35] leaves open the possibility that his arrival in Prague had been preceded by a short period travelling abroad specifically to enable him to fulfil his commission in the most informed and up-to-date manner possible. Such a study trip might explain in part the puzzlingly protracted interval separating the death of Matthew of Arras in 1352 and Parler's arrival in Prague four years later.[36] Moreover, the resemblance between the three-dimensional

[32] Some points of resemblance between Parler's work at Prague and Cologne Cathedral have been viewed as evidence for concluding that there was a desire to demonstrate parity with the older archiepiscopal church; Christian Freigang, "Köln und Prag. Der Prager Veitsdom als Nachfolgerbau des Kölner Domes", in *Dombau und Theologie im mittelalterlichen Köln. Festschrift zur 750-Jahrfeier der Grundsteinlegung des Kölner Domes und zum 65. Geburtstag von Joachim Kardinal Meisner* (Studien zum Kölner Dom, 6), Cologne, 1998, p. 49-86. However, the reality of one of the supposed resemblances on which that interpretation rests is challenged in Paul Crossley, "Peter Parler and England", p. 81, note 63. In my opinion the features in question are probably not numerous or recognisable enough by non-architects to have functioned effectively as conveyors of meaning, and therefore Cologne's influence, such as it is, may be attributed to the fact that it was the grandest Rayonnant cathedral anywhere and also to Parler's very strong family connections with the city. The main arcade spandrels of Regensburg Cathedral, the most ambitious German Rayonnant building begun in the late thirteenth century, have recently been proposed as the source for the recessing of the spandrels above the Prague clearstorey; Marc Carel Schurr, "Saint-Guy de Prague: Une cathédrale gothique 'à la française'? Réflexions sur les sources de son architecture", in *Bulletin monumental*, 162, 2004, p. 273-287 at p. 278. Perhaps a closer parallel is the east wall of the Wells choir, where the spandrel treatment resembles Prague's in being external and at clearstorey level; Wilson, *Gothic Cathedral*, p. 231; Bony, *English Decorated Style*, plates 238, 317.

[33] So far as France was concerned, Parler may well have been able to rely on research undertaken by or on behalf of his father Heinrich for, as is well known, the outer wall of the choir at Schwäbisch Gmünd is based on the circuit of chapels added to the hemicycle of Notre-Dame in Paris from 1296. It says much for Heinrich Parler's acumen that he should have identified and exploited as a source a building which is one of the very few formally innovatory projects undertaken by a major northern French ecclesiastical institution around 1300.

[34] For two little-known English examples see Harvey, *English Mediaeval Architects*, p. 153; Pamela Nightingale, *A Medieval Mercantile Community. The Grocers' Company & the Politics & Trade of London 1000-1485*, New Haven & London, 1995, p. 412.

[35] Kotrba, "Wann kam Peter Parler nach Prag?", p. 511-512. For the inscriptions accompanying the triforium busts see most recently Milena Bartlová, "The Choir Triforium of Prague Cathedral Revisited: The Inscriptions and Beyond", in *Prague and Bohemia*, ed. Zoë Opačić, p. 81-100, esp. p. 94-97.

[36] For journey times between Bohemia and England see Marek Suchý, "England and Bohemia in the time of Anne of Luxembourg: Dynastic Marriage as a Precondition for Cultural Contact in the Late Middle Ages", in *Prague and Bohemia*, ed. Zoë Opačić, p. 8-21 at p. 8. Travelling in England as the architect-designate of Prague Cathedral would presumably have been much easier than travelling solo as a journeyman. Parler's own status and his Cologne connections, not to mention the status of his imperial patron, would have gained him the cooperation of the merchants of the London "Hanse of Almain" who, by virtue of their extensive trading networks within England and their privileged relations with the Crown, would have been well able to smooth his path in relation to such practicalities as translators, guides and letters of introduction. Direct communication between Charles IV and Edward III on Parler's behalf is a possibility, despite the lack of surviving documentary evidence, and despite the fact that relations between the Bohemian and English courts can hardly have been cordial in the years following the death of Charles IV's father at Crécy in August 1346. For the leadership of the Prague lodge between 1352 and 1356 see Klára Benešovská, "Das Frühwerk Peter Parlers am Veitsdom", in *Umění*, 47, 1999, p. 351-362 at p. 355-356.

form of the domical vault with penetrations covering the Wenceslas Chapel designed around 1360, and that built over the Wells Lady Chapel almost forty years earlier provides a measure of corroboration for the theory that Parler's knowledge of Thomas of Witney and William Joy's work had been acquired before his arrival in Prague; indeed if that knowledge had derived, as Paul Crossley and I have suggested, from first-hand study, it would have had to be obtained before 1356, since there are no grounds for supposing that Parler was not continuously present in Bohemia after that date.[37]

The case for English influence on Parler's seminal work at Prague Cathedral has found no champions among German scholars writing in the last few decades, but Paul and I can perhaps take heart from the fate of the notion, widely entertained in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Germany, that Gothic itself originated there, for once the comparative study of Gothic got under way in the mid-nineteenth century it rapidly became obvious that this chauvinistic figment would have to be discarded. Even so, it seems extraordinary that today, half a century after Pevsner and Bock's initial revelation of the fundamental nature of the English influences evident at Prague, their work and the corroborative findings of later scholars continue to be ignored or brushed aside by those who will not take the trouble to consider the issue carefully. It would naturally be very gratifying for me if the present paper were to prove persuasive, but a hardly less satisfactory outcome would be its acceptance as a challenge worthy of being taken up by those who remain genuinely unconvinced that the founder of Central Europe's Late Gothic tradition drew much of his inspiration from his encounter with the works of some of the most gifted English architects of earlier generations.

[37] The small horizontal ceiling which Parler included at the centre of the sacristy's east bay, possibly in conformity with Arras's intentions, has been compared, not unreasonably, to Perpendicular fan vaulting (Benešovská, "Das Frühwerk", p. 362, note 14), but it is also reminiscent of the central parts of the vaults in the Wells choir aisles and the Ottery St Mary transepts.

The Liebfrauenkirche in Trier: Form and Meaning in Early Gothic Architecture in the Holy Roman Empire

Marc Carel Schurr

The Church of Our Lady (Liebfrauenkirche) in Trier is considered to be the first, or at least one of the first, buildings in the German-speaking countries to be executed in the Gothic style (Figs 1-3).[1] Yet, just when construction of this church began is not entirely clear. Whereas Nicola Borger-Keweloh argued in favour of a relatively late starting date of 1238,[2] Wolfgang Schenkluhn and Peter van Stiepelen proposed an earlier date of 1227[3] - a date that had first been recorded in 1670[4] and that was subsequently favoured by earlier scholarship.[5]

Current research hinges on the interpretation of three documents, which contain the only written information on the construction of Liebfrauen. The first document dates from 1227; among other things, it anticipates a provincial synod, to be held in Trier's Liebfrauenkirche. Schenkluhn and van Stiepelen, however, have shown that this particular synod did not take place in 1227, but in 1277;[6] the date "1227", in other words, seems to be the result of a transcription error. Moreover, such synods were generally convened at the so-called Krummstuhl in the Liebfrauen cloister, not in the church.[7] Our source from 1227/1277 is therefore wholly unreliable for establishing the chronology of the Liebfrauenkirche.

The second document is a legal act of 1233, signed *in claustro ante ostium beate Marie*.[8] Stephan Beissel was the first to conclude from this that in 1233 the predecessor of Liebfrauen was still standing and that the construction of the Gothic church had not yet been begun.[9] This interpretation in turn informed Borger-Keweloh's late dating of "1238" for the start of the Gothic campaign. In my opinion this is a highly problematic argument. The phrase *in claustro ante ostium beate Marie* does not necessarily imply that in 1233 the old church was still intact. The new, Gothic church could very well have

[1] Stephan Beissel, "Die Kirche U. L. Frauen zu Trier", in *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst*, 11/8, 1899, p. 232-247; Paul Clemen, *Die kirchlichen Denkmäler der Stadt Trier mit Ausnahme des Domes* (Die Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinprovinz, 13.3.3), Düsseldorf, 1938; Ernst Gall, "Über die Maße der Liebfrauenkirche: Form und Inhalt", in *Kunstgeschichtliche Studien Otto Schmitt zum 60. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, 1950, p. 97-104; Hans Eichler, "Ein frühgotischer Grundriß der Liebfrauenkirche in Trier", in *Trierer Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst des Trierer Landes und seiner Nachbargebiete*, 22, 1953, p. 145-166; Nicola Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche in Trier: Studien zur Baugeschichte,* Trier, 1986; Wolfgang Schenkluhn & Peter Van Stiepelen, "Architektur als Zitat: Die Trierer Liebfrauenkirche in Marburg", in *700 Jahre Elisabethkirche in Marburg, 1: Die Elisabethkirche – Architektur in der Geschichte*, ed. Hans-Joachim Kunst, Marburg, 1983, p. 15-30; *Streit um Liebfrauen: Eine mittelalterliche Grundrißzeichnung und ihre Bedeutung für die Liebfrauenkirche zu Trier*, ed. Leonhard Helten (exhibition catalogue, Trier, Bischöflichen Dom - und Diözesanmuseum), Trier, 1992; Leonhard Helten, "Auf den Fußspuren Mariens: Zur Datierung und Rezeption der Liebfrauenkirche in Trier", in *Ordo et Mensura III*, ed. Dieter Ahrens & Rolf C. A. Rottländer, St. Katharinen, 1995, p. 234-240.

[2] Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche*, p. 130.

[3] Schenkluhn & Van Stiepelen, "Architektur als Zitat", p. 29 note 24.

[4] Christoph Brower & Jakob Masen, *Antiquitatum et annalium Trevirensium libri XXV, duobus tomis cmprehensi, auctoribus R.R. P.P. Soc Jesu Browero et Masenio*, Liège, 1670, p. 126, 138. According to these two authors a now-lost inscription recorded that construction had begun in 1227.

[5] Georg Dehio & Gustav Von Bezold, *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes*, vol. 2, Stuttgart, 1901, p. 210.

[6] Schenkluhn & Van Stiepelen, "Architektur als Zitat", p. 29 note 24; see also Karl Pellens, *Der Trierer Erzbischof Dietrich II. von Wied (1212-1242),* Trier & Fribourg, 1960, p. 21.

[7] Schenkluhn & Van Stiepelen, "Architektur als Zitat", p. 29 note 24.

[8] *Mittelrheinisches Urkundenbuch* (henceforth *MRUB*), 3, no. 485, p. 377-379.

[9] Beissel, "Die Kirche U. L. Frauen", p. 234-235.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100134

Fig. 1. Trier, Liebfrauenkirche, west façade and north-western apse (Marc Carel Schurr)

Fig. 2. Trier, Liebfrauenkirche, interior looking north-east (Marc Carel Schurr)

Fig. 3. Trier, Liebfrauenkirche, ground plan (Marc Carel Schurr)

been under construction, whereas some parts of the old building, including the portal (*ostium*) giving onto the cloisters, may not yet have been demolished. The fact that the portal is mentioned does by no means suggest that the church behind it still existed! Furthermore, it is not unthinkable at all that in 1233, after a few years of construction, the choir of the new church had been completed up to the level above the dado walls, including the eastern portal on the axis of the choir that opens onto the cloisters. If this reading is right, the source from 1233 already refers to the Gothic church, which would suggest that a starting date of 1227 – or even earlier – is entirely plausible. Such a speedy progress of construction, especially in the first years of a building campaign, was not without parallels[10] and is certainly conceivable for the Liebfrauenkirche, particularly as the dimensions of this building are rather moderate. This observation is substantiated by the fact that the third written source suggests that construction nearly came to a halt in the 1240s; the document in question is a letter of indulgence dated 1243 and written on behalf of Liebfrauen's suffering *fabrica*.[11] Nicola Borger-Keweloh´s analysis of the

[10] Comparative cases are provided by the eastern parts of the Elisabethkirche in Marburg (see Gerd Strickhausen, "Die Elisabethkirche in Marburg: Kirche des Deutschen Ordens", in *Burgen kirchlicher Bauherren*, ed. Thomas Biller, Munich & Berlin, 2001, p. 139-156) and the case of St. Vincent in Metz (Christoph Brachmann, *Gotische Architektur in Metz unter Bischof Jacques de Lorraine (1239 –1260): Der Neubau der Kathedrale und seine Folgen*, Berlin, 1998, p. 69-83).

[11] *MRUB*, 3, no. 770, p. 580.

Fig. 4 Toul Cathedral, crossing and choir (Marc Carel Schurr)

Fig. 5. Toul Cathedral, choir, cross-section of the south-western pier of the south lateral chapel (drawing by Katharina Papajanni)

history of construction of Liebfrauen has also convincingly shown that only ten years later the building had reached an advanced level of completion.[12] But when, if not during the 1220s and 1230s, were the major parts of the church built, keeping in mind that the campaign slowed down during the 1240s, but again picked up for the edifice to be sufficiently advanced by or around 1250? In light of this evidence, it seems reasonable to assume an earlier rather than later start of construction, particularly as none of the written records speaks against a date in the middle or late 1220s.

An early date is also supported by stylistic analysis. As I have demonstrated elsewhere, the stylistic peculiarities of the Liebfrauenkirche are directly derived from those of the cathedral of Toul (Fig. 4).[13] Toul Cathedral, begun in 1221, represents nothing less than the first consistently Gothic

[12] Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche*, p. 131.

[13] Marc Carel Schurr, *Gotische Architektur im mittleren Europa 1220-1340: Von Metz bis Wien*, München & Berlin, 2007, p. 27-29.

building in the Holy Roman Empire.[14] As Alain Villes has shown, the first master of Toul probably came from the workshop of Reims Cathedral.[15] This explains the use of such characteristic elements as the extremely naturalistic foliage on the capitals, the prevalent use of the *pilier cantonné*, and the two-layered construction of the outer walls with the typical *passage rémois* at both Reims and Toul, as well as at Trier: hence the traditional and until recently still prevalent view that the forms of the Liebfrauenkirche were directly influenced by those of Reims Cathedral.[16] On closer inspection, however, some details are only unique to the cathedral of Toul and Our Lady at Trier. The most important stylistic innovation introduced by the first master of Toul Cathedral is the undulating profile of the pillars flanking the entrance to the lateral chapels (Fig. 5).[17] This design has no predecessor in French Gothic architecture, nor does it seem to have had any significant impact in the west, and it also does not appear in Reims. In the Empire, however, the soft, continuous junction of shafts and columns, which generates an undulating moulding, can be found at Trier and St Elizabeth's in Marburg.[18] This feature was to become a hallmark of Gothic architecture in the German-speaking countries, making Toul cathedral one of the chief starting points for German Gothic architecture.[19] The reception and imitation of the new design of Toul hardly comes as a surprise, especially considering that the bishopric of Toul was suffragan to the archbishopric of Trier. But there are even more details that prove the closeness between the workshops of Toul and Trier. For example, in both buildings the main columns of the undulating piers are flanked by very slim shafts that are not structurally connected to any of the vaulting ribs above the capital zone. Their only function is to enrich the play of light and shadow on the piers' surface.[20] This very rare and original motif is particular only to Toul and Trier. That both lodges were in continuous dialogue with each other is furthermore demonstrated by the crossing piers of the two buildings. The eastern crossing piers of Toul Cathedral are divided into two storeys, a *pilier cantonné* supporting the arcades, and a *pilier fasciculé* above (Fig. 4). It appears that the master of Toul cathedral had initially intended to use the *pilier cantonné* for the nave, but then decided to retain this design for the crossing. This may seem logical if one considers the horizontal organisation of the interior of the church, but it nevertheless resulted in a break in the vertical development of the crossing piers.

At Trier, the architect found a much better solution for this problem by using the *pilier cantonné* for both storeys; the result was a monumentalised *pilier cantonné*, in which the only sub-division was suggested by a capital frieze (Fig. 2). When the western crossing piers of Toul Cathedral were built around 1240, the architect reverted to this design and further unified the piers' structure by leaving out the capital frieze that separated the storeys at Trier (Fig. 4). This not only shows the close association between the two building lodges, but also supports my early dating of Trier's Liebfrauenkirche.

The early date of its construction alone assures the Liebfrauenkirche an important place in the history of western architecture. More significantly, perhaps, the Liebfrauenkirche exhibits a very unusual, and more or less unique, spatial structure. Erected over a centralized plan, the church consists of four arms of equal length (with the exception of the elongated choir) representing a Greek cross, which are complemented by diagonally planted chapels in the corners of the crossing (Fig. 3). Whereas

[14] Alain VILLES, *La Cathédrale de Toul: Histoire et architecture*, Metz, 1983, p. 65-71; SCHURR, *Gotische Architektur*, p. 14-20.

[15] VILLES, *La Cathédrale de Toul*, p. 65-71.

[16] See DEHIO & VON BEZOLD, *Die kirchliche Baukunst*, and Ernst GALL, *Die gotische Baukunst in Frankreich und Deutschland*, vol. 1, Braunschweig, 1925; but see also BORGER-KEWELOH, *Die Liebfrauenkirche*, p. 127, and SCHENKLUHN & VAN STIEPELEN, "Architektur als Zitat", p. 30-32, 38.

[17] SCHURR, *Gotische Architektur*, p. 17-18.

[18] *Ibidem*, p. 36.

[19] VILLES, *La Cathédrale de Toul*, p. 209-239; SCHURR, *Gotische Architektur*.

[20] An exception is the nave of St George's at Séléstat in the Alsace, which likewise appears to be influenced by Lorrainese workshops.

Fig. 6. Aachen, Palatine Chapel, west façade and atrium (Marc Carel Schurr)

nave, choir and transept have a two-storied elevation, the chapels only reach the height of the arcades, so that the building as a whole assumes a basilical shape (Figs. 1-3).

Whereas the style of the Liebfrauenkirche is clearly derived from Toul Cathedral, it is difficult to come up with a model for its original ground plan. The diagonally planted lateral chapels appear to be derived from the abbey church of St-Yved in Braine.[21] But, as Bruno Klein has pointed out, the placement of these chapels is the only discernible link between these two churches.[22] In stylistic terms both buildings could not be more different from each other. If one accepts the early date of the Liebfrauenkirche, this church might even have been the forerunner, rather than the successor, of St-Yved.

Fig. 7. Aachen, Palatine Chapel, interior Marc Carel Schurr)

Some twenty-five years ago, Schenkluhn and van Stiepelen proposed that the Liebfrauenkirche was conceived as an updated version of the Palatine Chapel in Aachen,[23] Charlemagne's prestigious court chapel and the traditional coronation church of the German kings. Just as Our Lady at Trier, the Palatine Chapel is extrapolated from a centralized ground plan – here an inner octagon and an outer, sixteen-sided polygon, combined with a porticus in the west and a rectangular choir in the east. Schenkluhn's and van Stiepelen's argument is primarily historical.[24] Trier's Liebfrauenkirche was thus constructed during the term of office of Archbishop Dietrich von Wied,[25] who in contrast to the two other archbishop-electors – those of Mainz and Cologne – was a loyal follower of the imperial party at that time. As it was by no means certain who of the three archbishops was entitled to crown the German king, Dietrich may have wished to lay claim to this privilege by erecting a coronation church modelled on that of Aachen, which, after all, itself belonged to the archbishopric of Cologne. However, except for their centralizing ground plan the churches of Trier and Aachen have little in common, especially if their interior appearance is taken into consideration. The closest similarity exists between their west facades, which are tall and slender, tower-like structures (Figs. 1, 6). The most typical motif of the Palatine Chapel's facade, the monumental, imperial-style exedra, is however not repeated at Trier. The interior of the Liebfrauenkirche is even less reminiscent of the Palatine Chapel. Its central space is essentially nothing else but a crossing of nave and transept, crowned by a tower. In contradistinction to Aachen (Fig. 7), one never has the impression of being in the centre of a huge space that expands uniformly in all directions. Instead, the visitor's eye is constantly drawn towards the longitudinal axis that connects the main entrance in the west to the choir in the

[21] Carl Schnaase, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste, 5: Geschichte der bildenden Künste im Mittelalter, 3: Entstehung und Ausbildung des gotischen Styles*, Düsseldorf, 1865, p. 368-369.

[22] Bruno Klein, *Saint-Yved in Braine und die Anfänge der hochgotischen Architektur in Frankreich* (Veröffentlichung der Abteilung Architekturgeschichte des kunsthistorischen Instituts der Universität zu Köln, 28), Cologne, 1984, p. 230-234; Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche,* p. 118-119.

[23] Schenkluhn & Van Stiepelen, "Architektur als Zitat", p. 34-36

[24] *Ibidem*, p. 28-29, 36

[25] On Dietrich, see Pellens, *Der Trierer Erzbischof Dietrich II*.

Fig. 8. Metz Cathedral general view from the north-west (Marc Carel Schurr)

east (Fig. 2). Likewise, there is no trace here of what is perhaps the most spectacular feature of Aachen's interior – the large and tall galleries with Charlemagne's (alleged) throne, which featured so prominently in every coronation ritual (Fig. 8). If Dietrich von Wied had indeed been the principal sponsor of the Liebfrauenkirche and the instigator of a new Palatine Chapel project, could he really have dispensed without this important throne and coronation gallery? Aside from these issues, the sources contain not a single hint of a personal involvement of Dietrich von Wied or any of his successors in the construction of Liebfrauen, even less so of major financial contributions.[26] Instead, the surviving documents show that the church was financed and used more or less exclusively by the cathedral chapter.[27] This is in complete agreement with what Wolfgang Schöller observed in his extensive study of several major cathedrals – namely, that the patrons of these buildings were almost always the chapters, and hardly ever the bishops![28]

Neither the structure and function of Liebfrauen nor any of the written sources suggest that the construction was initiated by anyone else but the cathedral chapter. The notion that the choice of the Gothic style had anything to do with a putative new coronation church at Trier – a notion put forward by Schenkluhn and van Stiepelen with regard to Reims chathedral[29] – likewise needs to be debunked, for, as we have seen, the design of Liebfrauen looks back to Toul Cathedral rather than – or perhaps only indirectly – to the coronation church of the French kings. If the "Aachen-theory" is a

[26] Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche,* p. 25.

[27] The chapter appears to have used the church on a daily basis (see Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche*, p. 135-137).

[28] Wolfgang Schöller, *Die rechtliche Organisation des Kirchenbaues im Mittelalter, vornehmlich des Kathedralbaues: Baulast, Bauherrenschaft, Baufinanzierung*, Cologne, 1989.

[29] Schenkluhn & Van Stiepelen, "Architektur als Zitat", p. 36.

dead end, are there perhaps other possible explanations for the unusual choice of a centralized ground plan at Trier? Archaeological excavations have revealed that to the southeast of Liebfrauen there once stood a circular building with three eastern, apse-like endings.[30] We do not know the use of this building or when it ceased to exist. We may nevertheless imagine that some of its functions were later assumed by Liebfrauen; hence perhaps also the latter's centralized plan.[31]

This particular type of plan likewise characterizes the funerary monuments of classical Antiquity and early Christianity,[32] and it is certainly no coincidence that the Liebfrauenkirche also functioned as a kind of burial chapel for the members of the cathedral chapter.[33] But there may be yet another explanation. Not far away in Metz – another suffragan bishopric of Trier – a new cathedral was about to be built in the Gothic style.[34] Again, it is controversial when construction began and whether it was the bishop or the cathedral chapter who were at the helm.[35] I do not wish to comment on this particular discussion here, but it seems quite possible that planning for the new cathedral of Metz had begun as early as the 1220s, more or less conjointly with Our Lady in Trier. What is more, if we consider the fact that the masons in Trier probably came from its suffragan in Toul and that Metz equally was suffragan to Trier, we may well surmise that all these bodies of patrons – the cathedral chapters of Toul, Trier and Metz – knew about each other's projects and the discussions that were initiated by them.

Just like the Liebfrauenkirche the design of the cathedral of Metz may, at least in part, have looked back to a centralized predecessor, here a round church in front of the old cathedral dedicated to the Virgin Mary and called Notre-Dame-la-Ronde.[36] This structure is no longer extant, as it was integrated into the nave of the new Gothic cathedral (Fig. 8). Of Carolingian or even older origin and thus invested with particular prestige and dignity, Notre-Dame-la-Ronde was probably sacrificed by Metz's cathedral chapter to provide space for a truly great church – one that could keep up with the dimensions of the large new cathedral at Toul. The notion that Notre-Dame-la-Ronde – an important example of a centralized church dedicated to the Virgin – provided the inspiration for the construction of Our Lady in Trier was advanced by Wolfgang Götz as early as 1968.[37] But this influence may have gone beyond the Marian tradition. In the eyes of the tradition-conscious members of the chapter of Trier Cathedral, who after all resided in the remains of Constantine the Great's palace, the demolition of Notre-Dame-la-Ronde and its integration into the new Gothic cathedral must have come close to sacrilege. Perhaps, then, the centralized plan of the Liebfrauenkirche was intended as a kind of demonstration (probably in particular for the members of the chapter of Metz Cathedral) that a venerable building such as Notre-Dame-la-Ronde could well exist side by side – or even in symbiosis with – a great Gothic church. In the design of the Liebfrauenkirche Notre-Dame-la-Ronde is brought up-to-date, in accordance with the modern Gothic style, but without abandoning the latter's characteristic appearance of a symmetrically centralized structure. And perhaps the construction of Liebfrauen – as an attempt to (re-)create Notre-Dame-la-Ronde or at least a modern counterpart thereof – was also

[30] Theodor-Kurt Kempf, "Die vorläufigen Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf dem Gelände des Trierer Domes", in *Germania*, 29, 1951, p. 47-58.

[31] Schurr, *Gotische Architektur*, p. 25-26.

[32] Günter Bandmann, *Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger*, Berlin, 1951, p. 185-190. See also Matthias Untermann, *Der Zentralbau im Mittelalter: Form, Funktion, Verbreitung*, Darmstadt, 1989.

[33] Borger-Keweloh, *Die Liebfrauenkirche*, p. 137.

[34] Brachmann, *Gotische Architektur in Metz*, p. 31-54; Alain Villes, "Remarques sur les campagnes de construction de la cathédrale de Metz au XIIIe siècle", in *Bulletin Monumental*, 162, 2004, p. 243-272; Schurr, *Gotische Architektur*, p. 65-74.

[35] On the dating of the cathedral see note 34. Christoph Brachmann argues in favour of a leading role of bishop Jacques de Lorraine (Brachmann, *Gotische Architektur in Metz*, p. 111-124); for a different view see Peter Kurmann's review of Brachmann's study, in *Bulletin Monumental*, 162, 2004, p. 321-322.

[36] Norbert Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, New Haven & London, 2000, p. 43.

[37] Wolfgang Götz, *Zentralbau und Zentralbautendenz in der gotischen Architektur*, Berlin, 1968, p. 50-54.

an act of demonstrating (existing or endangered) ecclesiastical power, since the chapter in Metz was subordinate to the archbishop of Trier.[38] If this were indeed the case, the erection of Metz Cathedral and the Liebfrauenkirche – as well as that of Toul – may be understood as the result of a "building race" between competing chapters. Alain Villes has recently thrown light on a similar case – here the cathedral and collegiate church of Notre-Dame-en-Vaux at Châlons-en-Champagne.[39]

At any rate, if the Liebfrauenkirche had been intended to represent some kind of successor or parallel to Notre-Dame-la-Ronde in Metz, its design would have helped maintain and foster the memory and prestige of the Carolingian tradition[40] in Trier and its archbishopric. This would certainly have been in the interest of both Archbishop Dietrich and the members of the chapter, giving both of them a reason to commission the church of Our Lady in this highly original form which makes it one of the most fascinating buildings of Gothic architecture in Europe.

[38] Fritz Grimme, "Die Bedingungen für die Wahl der Metzer Domherren im Mittelalter", in *Elsaß-Lothringisches Jahrbuch*, 4, 1925, p. 45-54; see also Jean Schneider, *La ville de Metz aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles,* Nancy, 1950.

[39] Alain Villes, *La cathédrale Saint-Étienne de Châlons-en-Champagne et sa place dans l'architecture médiévale*, Langres, 2007, p. 44-77.

[40] On the important role of Metz during the Carolingian epoch, see Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Die Karolinger und die Stadt des Heiligen Arnulf", in *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 1, 1967, p. 250-364.

Te bene dotavit ...: Heinrich of Finstingen, Archbishop of Trier (1260-1286), as Patron

Christoph Brachmann

Only recently, a study on the archbishop of Trier, Heinrich of Finstingen (born circa 1220; archbishop August 1260 - 26 April, 1286), focused on his chantry foundation in the cathedral of Trier.[1] From this foundation survives an inscription plaque,[2] celebrating the dead archbishop, and a large trefoil arch, now located immediately north of the entrance to the neighbouring church of Our Lady (Liebfrauenkirche) (Fig. 1). Originally, the arch covered the now lost sarcophagus with Heinrich's effigy, which was probably the first figurative image on a tomb of any of the archbishops of Trier.[3] Among the surviving objects is Heinrich's crosier, magnificently decorated with Limousin enamel work. It was found, in 1851, together with a chalice,[4] in the archbishop's tomb.[5] Originally, the tomb was associated with a new altar dedicated to Saint Erasmus.[6] A chantry foundation combining a tomb with an altar was highly unusual at Trier Cathedral at that time.[7]

Despite its innovative and elaborate setting, Heinrich's tomb appears positively modest in comparison with that of his far better-known successor, Balduin of Luxemburg (1307-1354). Balduin had chosen to be buried in the manner of a major patron of the church in a monumental, free-standing tomb in the centre of the western choir. He was entitled to claim such a position to the extent that he was undoubtedly one of the most important territorial politicians on the bishop's throne at Trier. There is another reason for mentioning Balduin in connection with Heinrich of Finstingen. Until today, Balduin's fame as archbishop outshines the fact that his successes were due in no small part to Heinrich's previous achievements:[8] While the first half of Heinrich's twenty five years as archbishop was devoted to reinforcing his position at Trier,[9] in the remaining years (between 1272 and 1286) he revealed an astonishing ability to extend the territory and secular possessions of the archbishopric. A number of castles are the outwardly still visible signs of his successful policy to unite the dispersed

[1] Wolfgang Schmid, "Der Erasmusaltar im Trierer Dom. Eine Memorienstiftung des Erzbischofs Heinrich von Finstingen (gest. 1286)", in *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte*, 58, 2006, p. 79-107.

[2] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, Hannover, 1879, p. 456; for a German translation see: Emil Zenz, *Die Taten der Trierer. Gesta Treverorum*, vol. 4, Trier, 1960, p. 84. The motto *Te bene dotavit* ("He endowed you generously") that accompanies the title of this paper is also taken from this funerary inscription. In its original context it addresses the archbishopric of Trier.

[3] Stefan Heinz, Barbara Rothbrust & Wolfgang Schmid, *Die Grabdenkmäler der Erzbischöfe von Trier, Köln und Mainz*, Trier, 2004, p. 42. This composition resembles a number of tombs in the cathedral of Metz, such as, for example, the tomb of Bishop Dietrich Beyer of Boppard or of the architect Pierre Perrat.

[4] While the chalice is considered a contemporary, mid-thirteenth-century work from Trier, the far more precious crosier, according to Ronig, was a stylistically "old-fashioned" work and as such removed from liturgical use. *Schatzkunst Trier*, ed. Franz Ronig, Trier, 1984, p. 121, 141.

[5] J.N. von Wilmowsky, *Die historisch-denkwürdigen Grabstätten der Erzbischöfe im Dom zu Trier und die archäologisch-liturgisch und kunstgeschichtlichen Fundgegenstände in denselben*, Trier, 1876, p. 7, 14-15 and plate 2-3, 10.

[6] Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 84.

[7] Schmid, *Memorienstiftung*, p. 80, 103.

[8] Volker Henn, "Heinrich von Finstingen († 26.4.1286)", in *Rheinische Lebensbilder*, ed. Wilhelm Janssen, vol. 9, Cologne, 1982, p. 61-78, here p. 77.

[9] Heinrich was the first archbishop of Trier who did not receive his office in an election but by papal provision. Nonetheless, he was sent to Trier only as *Electus* and had to wait to receive the pallium until 1272. For more details see, for example: Franz Casper, *Heinrich II. von Trier. Vornehmlich in seinen Beziehungen zu Rom und zum Territorium (1260-1286)*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Marburg, 1899, p. 16-55; Henn, *Finstingen*, p. 62-66.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100135

Fig. 1. Tomb of Heinrich von Finstingen, tentative reconstruction of after J. N. Von Wilmowsky (*Die historisch-denkwürdigen Grabstätten der Erzbischöfe im Dom zu Trier und die archäologisch-liturgisch und kunstgeschichtlichen Fundgegenstände in denselben*, Trier, 1876)

Fig. 2. Archdiocese of Trier and the neighbouring German and French dioceses (Andreas Brachmann)

property of the archbishopric.[10] Thus, we know that he completely rebuilt, among others, castle Bernkastel (1277); he founded, furthermore, the town of Mayen and built a castle there (1280), and he erected a new castle within the old Roman foundation of Koblenz.[11] The *Gesta Heinrici Archiepiscopi Treverensis* further comments these activities:[12] "He renovated most sumptuously with great buildings castle Saarburg and also the palaces of Trier, Pfalzel, Grimburg, Welschbillig, Neuerburg […]. He restored […] many possession of the Church of Trier".[13] The author of the *Gesta*,[14] who maintains a distinctly reserved attitude towards the archbishop, adds that Heinrich has done all this "more for the glory of the world than for the praise of God […]".[15] In fact, he argues, the archbishop snatched properties from the ecclesiastical institutions of the archbishopric in order to construct castles on them that served the extension of his worldly power. But he did not evade divine justice and was struck with a serious illness,[16] which was to cause his death in 1286.

However, Heinrich's ambition was clearly not quite as one-sided as the chronicler pretends. Evidence for this can be found in the *Vita Henrici Archiepiscopi altera*. The author, concerned for the archbishop's reputation, connects him with two religious foundations (although this appears only in a posthumous addition to the text): the collegiate churches in Kyllburg, in the Eifel Mountains, and in Munster-en-Lorraine (Münster). Both churches were, according to the text, newly founded and dedicated by Heinrich.[17] The choice of their location, at a considerable distance from each other (Fig. 2), is closely connected with the history of the archbishop's family.[18]

Before the analysis of the two buildings related to the foundations, we shall give a brief survey of Heinrich's religious career. The purpose is not only to gain an impression of his personality. Heinrich's case, moreover, demonstrates forcefully the intricate network that existed throughout the region, at the interface between the Holy Roman Empire and the French Kingdom, and which is obscured by today's national and regional borders. A nephew of the bishop of Speyer, Heinrich of Leiningen (1245-1272), and a cousin of the bishop of Strasbourg, Wather of Geroldseck (1260-1263), Heinrich had particularly illustrious family connections. As the third son of Merbod II of Malberg and Finstingen (died 1225),[19] he was destined for the Church from the beginning.[20] His ancestors were a noble family

[10] For Heinrich's territorial politics see Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 82. For a summarizing description of his policy to erect new castles see, for example: Ingrid Bodsch, *Burg und Herrschaft. Zur Territorial- und Burgenpolitik der Erzbischöfe von Trier im Hochmittelalter bis zum Tod Dieters von Nassau († 1307)*, p. 143-175.

[11] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 460. For Koblenz see also: Casper, *Heinrich II. von Trier*, p. 70, 76.

[12] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 414-456, here p. 455; for a German translation see Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 13-84.

[13] Compare also the indications given on his funerary inscription. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 456; Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 84. For a summary of all these activities which included not only erection of new castles, but also the enlargement or the purchase of already existing castles, see, for example: Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 81-82, 84; Casper, *Heinrich II. von Trier*, p. 70-77.

[14] The author was the monk Heinrich of St. Matthias Abbey in Trier. The *Gesta* is not really a biography of the archbishop, but rather a polemic against Heinrich, who for several reasons which cannot be discussed here, was in permanent conflict with the abbey. Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 7.

[15] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 455. Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 82.

[16] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 455. Zenz, *Taten der Trierer*, p. 82.

[17] "*Nec est obmittendum, quod predictus dominus Heinricus archiepiscopus duas conventuales a fundamentis erexit et dedicavit ecclesias, videlicet Kyleburch [= Kyllburg] Treverensis dyocesis et Monasterium [= Münster], Metensis dyocesis, quas suo largissimo dotavit patrimonio, in quibus canonicos instituit* [...]". *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 24, p. 456-463 (p. 463).

[18] See also, Christoph Brachmann, *Um 1300. Vorparlerische Architektur im Elsaß, in Lothringen und Südwestdeutschland*, Korb, 2008, p. 119-135.

[19] E. Paulus, "Note sur les fondateurs et la date de fondation de la collégiale de Munster", in *Mémoires de l'Academie de Metz*, 85, 1893/94, p. 57-85, here p. 84; for the Malberg in general: Michel Parisse, *Noblesse et chevalerie en Lorraine médiévale. Les familles nobles du XIe au XIIIe siècle*, Nancy, 1982, p. 155-159.

[20] Henn, *Finstingen*, p. 62.

Fig. 3. Kyllburg, collegiate church, view of choir (Christoph Brachmann, 2008)

native to the Eifel Mountains in the diocese of Trier. As a result of their successful territorial politics, they had created a second powerbase around Finstingen in Lorraine, within the diocese of Metz, yet they continued to entertain close connections with the archbishopric of Trier. Although, in the Middle Ages, Finstingen was still situated in the German-speaking part of Lorraine, from the beginning of his Church career, Heinrich developed into a real cross-border commuter between the French and the German part of the archbishopric of Trier and beyond.[21] In fact, he appeared on both sides in different cathedral chapters: since 1241 as a canon in German-speaking Strasbourg and slightly later in two French-speaking cathedral chapters, namely from 1250 as papal chaplain and cantor in Verdun and from 1254 as cathedral dean in Metz.[22] Although his strongest connections were in the Lorraine and Elsass regions, it was finally, from 1260, the archbishopric of Trier over which he – until 1272 only formally – presided.

It is certain that one of the foundations mentioned in the *Vita* coincided with, and almost marked, his uncontested recognition in Trier which occurred in autumn 1272, when he received the pallium. This foundation was the collegiate church in Kyllburg (Fig. 3), where the start of the construc-

[21] One could mention several parallel cases from this period.

[22] Victor Chatelain, "Ein Vasallenverzeichnis der Herren von Finstingen aus der Mitte des XIII. Jahrhunderts", in *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde*, 7, 1895, vol. 2, p. 1-68, especially p. 11-13; Casper, *Heinrich II. von Trier*, p. 10; Henn, *Finstingen*, p. 62; *Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reiches 1198 bis 1448. Ein biographisches Lexikon*, ed. Erwin Gatz, Berlin, 2001, p. 796.

Fig. 4. Collegiate churches Kyllburg (left), Munster-en-Lorraine (right), ground plans (Christoph Brachmann, 2008)

tion on 8 May 1276 is evidenced by an original inscription found in the choir of the church.[23] The new church was located south of a castle erected in 1239 by his predecessor, Archbishop Theoderich of Wied (1212-1242).[24] Most importantly, however, it was in close vicinity to the castle at Malberg, which was his family seat and where Heinrich was possibly born.[25] The church was probably completed only in

[23] "AD GL(ORI)AM DEI ET IN HONOREM B(EATAE) V(IRGINIS) MATRIS SVAE O(MN)IVMQVE S(ANCTARVM) VIRGINVM HVI(VS) ECCL(ES)IAE (CON)STRVCTIO PER R(EVERENDI) SSIMVM D(OMINVM) HENR(I)CVM ARCHIEP(ISCOPVM) TREVIR(ENSEM) EIVSDEMQVE ILL(VST)RE CAP(ITV)LVM INCEPTA EST ANNO 1276 8 MAY" ("For the glory of God and in honour of the blessed Virgin, his mother, and of all the holy Virgins, the construction of this church was began by the most reverend lord, Heinrich, archbishop of Trier, and his illustrious chapter in the year 1276, on 8th May"). The date is further confirmed by the foundation charter of the college of 7 April 1276. These and other sources concerning Kyllburg are in the Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz (Best. 102); here quoted after: Franz-Josef HEYEN, *Das St.-Marien-Stift in Kyllburg* (*Germania sacra, N.F., 48: Die Bistümer der Kirchenprovinz Trier*), Berlin, 2007, p. 23, 134-135, 139-140.

[24] According to HEYEN, *Kyllburg*, p. 128, the castle represents a "deutliche, strategische Positionierung der Trierer Ansprüche in der Kyllregion" ("clear, strategic positioning of the Trier claims in the region of Kyll"). For the details: HEYEN, *Kyllburg*, p. 128; *Denkmaltopographie Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Kulturdenkmäler in Rheinland Pfalz*, vol. 9.1., *Kreis Bitburg-Prüm. Verbandsgemeinden Kyllburg und Speicher*, revised by Hans Hermann RECK, Worms, 1991, p. 76. The close connection with the bishopric is also shown by the fact that "die Besetzung [...] aller Kanonikate und Dignitäten dem Erzbischof vorbehalten war [...]." ("all canonries and dignities were conferred by the archbishop"), HEYEN, *Kyllburg*, p. 148.

[25] It is, moreover, certainly significant that on 16th May 1276, only a few days after the laying of the foundation stone, he issued an indulgence to support the construction of the church. A further indulgence was issued by the archbishop of Mainz, Werner of Eppstein, on 21 June 1279. HEYEN, *Kyllburg*, p. 252-253.

the fourteenth century, since a change of forms suggests an entirely separate, second construction campaign.[26]

While the date of the foundation is thus relatively well known, an in-depth art-historical assessment of the building is still missing, despite the fact that the quality of the architecture eclipses everything else in this region and period. The only general comment has been the repeated reference to building sites in the Rhineland.[27] While the origins of the architecture remained puzzling, there was much more specific evidence for the identity of the responsible architect. On 18th May 1284, Heinrich of Finstingen grants a house in Kyllberg to a *magister operis ecclesiae de Kylburch*, called *frater Henricus*, and to several *operarii et lapicides*.[28] In the past, scholars liked to identify the architect as a Cistercian monk from the neighbouring Himmerod, and – further developing this theory – they tried to interpret numerous features of the church as originating in Cistercian architectural traditions.[29] However, a closer look at the source reveals that *frater Henricus* is mentioned without specifying his origin.[30] One could, furthermore, question whether this is another case where the *magister operis* is not so much the master workman, but rather the administrator of the church *fabrica*.[31] Clearly, until now, beyond pure speculation nothing has been said about the real sources of the architectural forms.

The modest size of the church is related to its use by a small college of twelve canons (Fig. 4).[32] The interior is a single vessel of five bays, 36m in length. Lofty vaults, 17.5m at the apex, span an impressive width of 13.5m.[33] To the east follows a staggered choir consisting of a single choir bay and a central, eastern apse made from five sides of an octagon. The choir bay is flanked on both sides by a square apse with a low ceiling that can be accessed only from the main nave. A break occurred during the construction of the nave and the changes affected forms and construction techniques. For example, in the two eastern bays the walls are built from plastered rubble, while in the western bays they are made from ashlar stones. It is clear that the first campaign, under Heinrich, comprised only of the choir and the two eastern bays of the nave. The following analysis concentrates on that part of the church.

The oldest parts, built soon after 1276, are distinguished by an exquisitely light-filled and refined architecture (Fig. 3). An important element are the nave windows that open up most of the width and the height of each bay and are decorated with triple lancets crowned with three delicate, stacked trefoils. If the interior makes an overwhelming impression it is also because the nave is effectively experienced as a single, unitary space. There are no heavy features. Only the string-course that runs below the windows and the frail bundle of vaulting shafts set restrained caesurae. Following the ideal of spatial unification ("Raumvereinheitlichung"), each vaulting shaft has the same thickness and there is no distinction between the transverse arches and the ribs of the broad-spanned vault.

All these forms can equally be found in the eastern choir. Its entrance is marked by a large arch. Not only its smooth prolongation from the wall into the vaults without any capitals, but also its moulding profile consisting of different flat and hollow chamfers are, for their time, extremely progressive. The arches to the entrance of the side chapels are treated in a similar way. Generally, these concave, hollowed-out forms are positively the hall mark of the architecture at Kyllburg. Further highlighted

[26] This is also indicated by the charters and indulgences granted by Archbishop Balduin of Luxemburg, some of which mention explicitly the unfinished state of the church. Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 23, 253-254.

[27] Franz Ronig, *Die Stiftskirche Unserer Lieben Frau zu Kyllburg in der Eifel*, Passau, 2001, p. 4. Already Bock suggested that the responsible architect had previously been part of the Cologne building site. However, his architectural comparisons are not necessarily convincing. Franz Bock, *Kyllburg und seine kirchlichen Bauwerke des Mittelalters*, Kyllburg 1895, p. 9.

[28] Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 23.

[29] Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 28.

[30] For all the relevant sources see: Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 23.

[31] On the subject see, for example, Günter Binding, "*architectus, magister operis, wercmeistere*: Baumeister und Bauverwalter im Mittelalter", in *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*, 34, 1999, p. 7-28.

[32] Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 22.

[33] Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 23.

Fig. 5. Collegiate churches of Kyllburg (left), Munster-en-Lorraine (right), exterior view of choirs (Christoph Brachmann, 2008)

by the reconstructed architectural polychromy, they appear everywhere: on the formerets which extend all the way down to the string-course, on the interior and exterior window jambs which are themselves decorated with a concave profile, or on the ribs of the vaults in the flanking choir apses.

The filigree tracery, with its sharp-edged sections, follows the same general tendency. The windows in the choir are particularly delicate and idiosyncratic (Fig. 5): two trefoil lancets carry a framed quatrefoil which is crowned by a trefoil with extremely pointed apices. In the modest side chapels, on the other hand, the window designs consist of a single cusped lancet crowned with a trefoil (Fig. 3). Finally, a remarkable feature of the east end is the triple sedilia with its square frame and the double piscina, both situated in the south wall of the central choir apse. The latter is designed like a Gothic window. A central quatrefoil with – again – very pointed tips sits on top of two lancets filled with trefoil arches. This design will also be important in another context.[34]

The foundation of a college of canons, which some historians regard as already obsolete in the late thirteenth century,[35] is often seen in connection with Archbishop Heinrich of Finstingen's territo-

[34] It is unclear whether the two-story addition on the south side with the sacristy and the *armarium* is part of the first campaign (Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 28). It is a remarkable square room covered by four quadripartite rib-vaults. Along the walls, the ribs spring without capitals from corbels with the same moulding profile as the ribs and, in the centre, from a central column. However, arguments against a date in the thirteenth century are the progressive forms and, furthermore, the fact that the addition to the building caused overlaps with the windows of the nave.

[35] Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 137.

Fig. 6. Kyllburg, Collegiate Church, piscina and sedilia on south side of choir (Christoph Brachmann, 2008)

Fig. 7. Munster-en-Lorraine, Collegiate Church, view of choir (Markus Hilbich)

rial politics in this region, focused on the erection of castles (*Burgenpolitik*).[36] It has been argued that, next to the already existing castle Kyllburg, the new college with its canons chosen by the archbishop completed the power-political aspect of the fortification by highlighting the place's importance as a centre of spirituality, administration and justice.[37] What is so far missing, however, is a comparison with Heinrich's second foundation mentioned in the *Vita*, situated about 200 km further south in Munster-en-Lorraine near Albestroff (Fig. 7).[38]

As in Kyllburg, Heinrich had a strongly personal connection with this foundation. Munster was situated in the immediate vicinity of the town from which the archbishop of Trier derived his name and which was the main seat of his family: Finstingen, the present Fénétrange. However, the author of the *Vita* wrongly claimed that Heinrich had founded Munster himself. In fact, it was founded by his father, Merbod of Malberg and Finstingen,[39] probably at the time when Konrad of Scharfenberg was bishop of Metz (1212-1224). It is likely that there was a direct connection between the foundation and Merbod's investiture, in 1224, with the properties of Remiremont Abbey in and around Finstingen/Fénétrange.[40]

Heinrich's interest in the parental foundation is well documented: already on 9 April 1251 he obtained its confirmation from Pope Innocent IV.[41] In 1262 he donated properties to the college, which he had previously purchased in his capacity as cathedral dean at Metz.[42] But the main reason for the author of the *Vita* to connect Heinrich with Munster, was the fact that under Heinrich a construction campaign enhanced the status of the parental foundation. Several sources attest to this construction. On the 26 February 1293, and therefore shortly after Heinrich's death, the dedication of the altars in the eastern parts of the church took place.[43] Judging from the homogeneity of the building, most, if not all of the church, must have been completed at that date.[44] Although historians have been trying to guess the date of the laying of the foundation stone, astonishingly, an indulgence of 14 March 1271 which mentions the ongoing construction has remained unnoticed. The text reads: "[...] *iam chorum funditus incepimus mire et ample structure et opere sumptuoso* [...]".[45] This date fits in neatly with that of the foundation in Kyllburg and shows that Heinrich of Finstingen's initiative in Munster belongs to the same context, his acquisition of the pallium in 1272. In contrast to Kyllburg, Munster was situated far from the core area of the archbishopric of Trier and it is difficult to claim that, at Munster, Heinrich was promoting the affairs of the archbishopric. Rather, in view of the similarity of the circumstances (in each case a new church was built for a college consisting of twelve canons and a dean, and it was situated in the immediate vicinity of the seats of the lords of Malberg and Finstingen), it seems likely that the two foundations possess a much more personal character than was previously thought.

[36] It was mainly targeted against the Count of Luxemburg. Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 136.

[37] Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 138.

[38] See the discussion summarized by: Heyen, *Kyllburg*, p. 137.

[39] Paulus, *Fondateurs*, p. 84.

[40] It was in this context that the noble family changed their name. Earlier, Remiremont Abbey had already appointed the lords of Malberg advocate (*Vogt*) for the above-mentioned properties in Lorraine. See: Chatelain, "Ein Vasallenverzeichnis", p. 2-7; Parisse, *Noblesse*, p. 155-157, 386.

[41] Published in: *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde*, 4, 1892, p. 214; Paulus, *Fondateurs*, p. 83.

[42] Paulus, *Fondateurs*, p. 77-78; Franz Cuny, *Reformation und Gegenreformation im Bereich des früheren Archipresbyterates Bockenheim*, Metz, 1937, p. 99-109, here p. 100.

[43] Nancy, Archives départementales de Meurthe-et-Moselle G 928; Brachmann, *Um 1300*, p. 119.

[44] A break in the construction campaign can be detected only west of the two eastern nave bays, comparable to Kyllburg. However, at Munster, the interruption was clearly not very long. The only marginal differences with the eastern bays concern the narrow capitals which now clasp all the responds and not only the vaulting shafts and, furthermore, the key stones in the aisle vaults which now have figurative decorations.

[45] Nancy, Archives départementales de Meurthe-et-Moselle G 928; Paulus, *Fondateurs*, p. 79-81; Henri Lepage, *Les Communes de la Meurthe*, vol. 2, Nancy 1853, p. 89-90; *Kunst und Alterthum in Elsaß-Lothringen. Beschreibende Statistik im Auftrage des Kaiserlichen Ministeriums von Elsaß-Lothringen,* vol. 3, "Lothringen", ed. Franz Xaver Kraus, Strasbourg, 1889, p. 808.

Fig. 8. Munster-en-Lorraine, Collegiate Church, view of nave from north-east (Markus Hilbich)

As far as the church itself is concerned, the scaffold of dates mentioned above, further reinforced by the comparison with Kyllburg, also helps correcting the history of the construction. Until now, scholars argued for a curiously drawn-out campaign, extending into the fifteenth century.[46] In fact, the analysis shows that the two buildings are variants of each other, built in the 1270s: the probably slightly older Munster is no longer a single-vessel church, but a basilican church with a nave, consisting of a central vessel and two aisles, and a single-vessel transept (Figs. 4, 8).[47] To the east, however, the three-part staggered choir closely resembles that at Kyllburg. Following the single choir bay, the central apse rotates similarly as five parts of an octagon. In contrast to Kyllburg, however, the flanking apses are slightly set at an angle and end in three parts of a hexagon. Moreover, the difference in height between the central apse of the choir and the flanking apses is not quite as great as at Kyllburg. After these initial structural differences, the great similarities between the two churches are conspicuous, starting with the use of plastered rubble as a building material.[48] The comparisons among the details of the construction are even more obvious, such as the almost identical tracery designs. Thus, the windows of the choir apse at Kyllburg and Munster show only marginal differences (Fig. 5).[49] The tracery forms in the side chapels at Kyllburg, however, match exactly those at Munster, where they are also used in the aisles.[50] Equally, the pattern of the Kyllburg piscina can now be seen in the clerestorey (Figs 6, 8).[51] The concave, hollowed-out forms are, moreover, identical and can be found on the window jambs and formerets. The latter now effectively extend all the down to the pier bases, thus framing the bay. While the triple vaulting-shafts themselves are identical with Kyllburg (Fig. 9) and support the same type of transverse arch and rib, the formerets are now more clearly assigned to the bundle of shafts; clasped by the profile of the imposts they merge into a single unit (Fig. 8).[52] Yet, the most remarkable detail of the collegiate church in Munster is the, for their time, almost avant-garde nave pier, the detailing of which recalls the chancel arch at Kyllburg: Unusually, for the late thirteenth century, there are no compound piers or *piliers cantonnés* here, but instead a design that seems to have been carved out of the wall. The sides of the piers that face the arcade have a profile consisting of flat and concave chamfers which – only interrupted by an inconspicuous, narrow capital – continues into the arch. Facing the inner vessel, triple vaulting shafts have been applied to this uniform foil of arcades and wall, but facing the aisles, the piers are wall-like and flat. Here, the ribs of the vaults spring from small corbels.[53] It was probably this progressive form which led to the above-mentioned late dating. Comparisons not only with Kyllburg but also with the choir at Munster show, however, that it is indeed a thirteenth-century solution (Fig. 7). The choir was undoubtedly completed at the time of the dedication in 1293 and all relevant forms can already be found there.[54]

[46] See, for example, Marie-Claire Burnand, *La Lorraine gothique*, Paris, 1989, p. 238. Until now, there are few studies of the church, some of them written a long time ago, see the bibliographical indications in: Brachmann, *Um 1300*, p. 119, note 354. Further to what is said above, there are strong connections between the collegiate church and another late thirteenth-century building in the region: the Benedictine abbey church of Tholey, from after 1278. Brachmann, *Um 1300*, p. 123-125.

[47] The overall length of the building is 51,5 m, the width 16,5 m (Cuny, *Reformation*, p. 108), the height of the apex of the vault probably circa 20m.

[48] Furthermore, both at Kyllburg and at Munster the ashlar stones used for the exterior pier buttresses of the east end show conspicuous grip holes.

[49] Only the central window of the apse at Munster shows a slightly different tracery pattern.

[50] See Brachmann, *Um 1300*, Fig. 113. Some of the windows in the lateral apses have double lancets.

[51] Even minor features are identical, such as the roofs over the flying buttresses, including the blind trefoils below.

[52] In the slightly later western bays, the formerets are decorated with the entire capital, see note 46.

[53] They can also be found in Kyllburg, where they appear in the side chapels of the choir. The ribs of those chapels have concave moulding profiles, which are also characteristic for the aisles in Munster.

[54] Compare especially the piers that separate the central eastern apse and the side chapels. For all these details see further discussions in: Brachmann, *Um 1300*, p. 134.

Fig. 9. Kyllburg (left) and Munster-en-Lorraine (right), responds at the springing of the vaults in the choirs (Christoph Brachmann, 2008)

More generally speaking, it is difficult to reconcile the detailing found in both buildings with such a late dating. Comparable capitals, reduced to simple bands, can be found, for example, on the only slightly older piers of Narbonne Cathedral. Moreover, at Metz Cathedral, where Heinrich of Finstingen is known to have been dean after 1254,[55] the crossing piers, which are one or two decades older than Munster, show a complicated series of hollows, chamfers and roll mouldings which basically carry the potential for such progressive looking solutions, without necessarily representing a direct model. Nonetheless, as an entity the Munster piers remain unique and for their time almost avant-garde. In the first half of the fourteenth century, the pier type was adopted for the nave of the collegiate church of Saint-Arnual, a synthesis of ideas from Munster and early fourteenth-century Niederhaslach. Evidently, more than fifty years after its construction, the architecture of the collegiate church at Munster was still considered highly innovative.

Undoubtedly, the collegiate church of Munster (Figs 7, 8) disturbs the established image of Gothic architecture in the late thirteenth century since it calls into question any idea of a linear development of style: precocious solutions appear here already, which normally would be considered "Late Gothic" and connected with the fourteenth or even later centuries. The study of Munster, moreover, overturns the idea of a uniform period or regional style. Although there is no place here to discuss the subject in greater detail, already a brief comparison with, for example, the contemporary abbey church of Remiremont (dedicated 1299) makes the point.[56] In fact, the lords of Finstingen were associated with Remiremont because they held lands from the community of Benedictine nuns at the abbey. However, the architecture of the abbey church followed totally different models from Munster and, from a purely stylistic point of view, the two churches would have never been connected. It is striking testimony to the multiplicity of formal choices that existed at that time in greater region which are at opposite ends to the narrow stylistic focus of a regional style. This case study reveals clearly that simple formal correspondences are not sufficient evidence to establish relationships between objects, in this case architecture; another criterion is needed. For the region discussed here in the period around 1300, historical facts provide important additional evidence. Particularly helpful is the dense network of social connections that historians have reconstructed already some time ago and that was hardly affected by the language barrier separating the region, as not least the prebends of individual noblemen demonstrate.[57]

The archbishop of Trier, Heinrich von Finstingen, is certainly an illustrious representative of the region in this period. Moreover, his person and above all the two collegiate churches in Kyllburg in the Eifel Mountains and in Munster in Lorraine (Figs 3, 7), which he built in the 1270s, demonstrate almost paradigmatically how unhelpful current borders are to understanding a region. This is particularly significant since, in contrast to recent political developments that tend to remove them, from an art-historical point of view they have lost little of their importance until now.

Translated and edited by Alexandra Gajewski

[55] Chatelain, "Ein Vasallenverzeichnis", p. 11-13.

[56] For Remiremont see Brachmann, *Um 1300*, p. 76-80.

[57] See, for example, the discussion and bibliography in: Brachmann, *Um 1300*, p. 192-208, and: Michel Parisse, *Noblesse et chevalerie en Lorraine medievale. Les familles nobles du XIe au XIIIe siècle*, Nancy 1982.

Planning and Building without Writing: Questions of Communication in Gothic Masons' Lodges[1]

Norbert Nussbaum

Conventional wisdom in the study of architectural history suggests that the building modes we call styles "evolved" through the transfer of ideas about form, a process that has been explained in terms of artists' journeys and the deliberate adaptation of forms. This approach has generated many seemingly coherent narratives of style-driven formal development. The technologies of architectural production -including both the form-generating practices of the designer and the constructive practices of the builder - are treated in this methodological framework as mere means to the intended goal, which is an aesthetically or semantically perceptible form. This is fundamentally an art-historical view of cultural transfer, but one hesitates to accept its exclusive validity, because it is well known that architectural production is not always concerned first and foremost with the creation of formally defined structures. It would not be difficult, therefore, to critque this view from the perspective of architectural theory. My present goal, however, is to explore this theme along empirical rather than theoretical lines.

In archaeological studies of buildings, formal arrangement is seen as just one aspect of a structure's morphological and material character. The formal arrangement is just one sign, among many, of the spread and transformation of architectural knowledge, and by itself it remains only a weak indicator. In eras when knowledge was transmitted less in written form than in face-to-face exchange, which was overwhelmingly the case in the Early and High Gothic periods, it was surely easiest to describe forms by means of drawings, templates, or models. We can only speculate, however, about their possible role in form transfer before the middle of the thirteenth century, when the earliest surviving design drawings were produced. In terms of architectural design and building technology, the earlier phases of the Middle Ages appear to be essentially devoid of agency of transmission, unless we take seriously the idea that architecture was produced by mimetic processes in which the builders themselves served as media of information exchange. It is difficult, however, to investigate and document such processes. Facile interpretive constructs such as the "artistic landscape", the "monastic building tradition", or the postulated family bond between entire generations of artists, and their inclusion under the poorly conceptualized notion of "lodges" like the "Parler lodge", or the "Ensinger lodge" tend to be unhelpful in this context. The closer one looks, the fuzzier the concepts become. But what are the alternatives?

The first scaled orthogonal projections emerged in Gothic architectural culture around the middle decades of the thirteenth century. Bruno Klein sees this period as a watershed, in which the rise of drawing quickly revolutioned not only architectural planning and building practice, but also the media of transfer of artistic ideas.[2] The lack of older design drawings has often been explained by the claim that they were not needed previously.[3] They supposedly became necessary only after the systematic serial finishing of stones was introduced at the cathedral of Amiens - a case discussed long

[1] I owe gratitude to my colleague and dear friend Robert Bork for the translation of this article, which was originally written in German. I also want to thank Robert for the hours of delightful discussion that we spent on this topic during his stay in Cologne in the summer of 2009. More than once we wished Paul Crossley, who is a living archive of knowledge and creative thought, had been there to join our discourse.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100136

ago by Dieter Kimpel.[4] From that point onward, precise architectural drawings were required in advance to guarantee efficient planning, of the kind that one expects with modern architectural plans today. Such simple solutions would be all too tempting if the problem at hand did not involve so many unknowns. Why do most of the surviving design drawings stem from the territory of the former German Reich, while only a few survive from other European regions with flourishing traditions of Gothic ashlar construction? Were such drawings absolutely necessary for constructing and completing complex structures, and if so, were they based on standardized drafting procedures? What role did drawings play in the construction process? Did they serve as media for presentation and visualization, or as practical building plans, or both?

Design Geometries and the Pragmatics of their Implementation

Since most surviving Gothc drawings appear to be copies of the original design drawings, they contain very few of the blind construction lines that would help to make their geometrical structure visible. For that reason, almost all attempts to explain these designs in terms of triangulation, quadrature, or such figures do not hold up on closer examination. Exceptions to this rule, in my view, are the studies by Robert Bork, the most recent of which are distinguished by their high plausibility and precise reference to the original drawings, even if one cannot always follow their final steps.[5] Bork really appears to be on the trail of a kind of *lingua franca* of drafting culture in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and it is not hard to imagine how this might have been passed on from one designer to the next.

Johann Josef Böker has also presented impressive analyses showing the potential value of design drawings for communication on the construction site.[6] However, it is my view that their utilization in the actual construction process was quite limited and only indirect. Several observations pertaining to the Altenberg Cistercian church and its architectural-historical environment substantiate this suspicion.

[2] Bruno Klein, "Internationaler Austausch und beschleunigte Kommunikation. Gotik in Deutschland", in *Gotik*, ed. Bruno Klein (Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Deutschland, 3), München,Berlin,London & New York, 2007, p.9-33.

[3] On the state of debate, see Günther Binding & Susanne Lindscheid-Burdich, *Planen und Bauen im frühen und hohen Mittelalter nach den Schriftquellen bis 1250*, Darmstadt, 2002, p. 73-100.

[4] Dieter Kimpel, "Le développement de la taille en série dans l'architecture médiévale et son rôle dans l'histoire économique", in *Bulletin monumental*, 135, 1977, p. 195-222; Dieter Kimpel, "Die Versatztechniken des Kölner Domchores", in *Kölner Domblatt*, 44/45, 1979/80, p.277-292; Dieter Kimpel, "Ökonomie, Technik und Form in der hochgotischen Architektur", in *Bauwerk und Bildwerk im Hochmittelalter. Anschauliche Beiträge zur Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte*, ed. Karl Clausberg, Dieter Kimpel, Hans Joachim Kunst & Robert Suckale , Gießen, 1981, p. 103-125; Dieter Kimpel, "Die Entfaltung der gotischen Baubetriebe. Ihre sozio-ökonomischen Grundlagen und ihre ästhetisch-künstlerischen Auswirkungen", in *Architektur des Mittelalters*, ed. Friedrich Möbius & Ernst Schubert, Weimar 1983, p. 246-272; Dieter Kimpel, "Reims et Amiens. Étude comparative des chantiers", in *Artistes, artisans et production artistique au Moyen Age, Colloque international. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique Université de Rennes II. Haute-Bretagne 2.-6. May 1983*, ed. Xavier Barral I Altet, vol. 2, 1987, p. 349-363.

[5] Robert Bork, "Plan B and the Geometry of Façade Design at Strasbourg Cathedral, 1250-1350", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 64, 2005, p. 442-473; Robert Bork, "Stacking and "Octature" in the Geometry of Cologne Plan F", in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture*, ed. Alexandra Gajewski & Zoë Opačić (Architectura Medii Aevi, 1), Turnhout, 2007, p. 89-106.

[6] Johann Josef Böker, *Architektur der Gotik, Bestandskatalog der weltgrößten Sammlung an gotischen Baurissen (Legat Franz Jäger) im Kupferstichkabinett der Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien. Mit einem Anhang über die mittelalterlichen Bauzeichnungen im Wien-Museum Karlsplatz*, Salzburg, 2005.

The Altenberg chevet's geometry develops from the superposition of a circular figure centered on the keystone of the hemicycle, and a perspectival figure whose focal point coincides with the location of the high altar (Fig. 1).[7] The inner and outer piers of the chevet lie on radii struck through this focal point, so that a viewer standing there will find each outer pier precisely hidden by the corresponding inner one, an arrangement that provides an unimpeded view of the radiating chapels and their secondary altars. The arcade piers should theoretically occupy the corners of a dodecagon, which the designer would doubtless define in the planning process by subdividing an equilateral triangle. But this simple geometric operation was not applied at the building site, since the piers are subtly misaligned, with divergences from the dodecagon that increase as one moves outward from the building axis (Fig. 2). This indicates that the pier positions were established not by geometrical subdivision of the hemicycle, but rather by measuring out within its circular perimeter a series of chords, each with a length of 3.5 pier diameters. The pier diameters, in turn, are simple multiples of a foot unit of 33.2 centimetres — a unit that also very precisely determined the dimensions in the rest of the choir's ground plan and elevation. Between the design phase and the execution phase the method of form generation thus shifted from geometrical to arithmetical, even in places where the projected plan geometry could be only approximated with modules. Apparently the drawbacks of this simple but practical approach to layout were considered acceptable. In light of these findings, it seems unlikely that the figures Robert Bork has identified in the great façade drawings were transferred geometrically from the parchments to the building sites - especially since the upper construction zones would have been isolated from any polygons established at ground level. The case of Altenberg, where the geometry of the plan was translated into more readily buildable modular terms, must have been more typical. The intermediate steps in this translation process can be followed through various well-known mechanisms and media, including tracing floors, templates, and incised drawings on walls and floors - but not through written instructions explaining the procedures as such. Taking into account the builders' lack of technical vocabulary and language proficiency, such instructions would have probably caused as much confusion as do the operating manuals for modern electronic appliances, and, in any case, most of the stonemasons would have been illiterate.

Fig. 1. Altenberg, former Cistercian Abbey Church, choir geometry (Norbert Nussbaum)

[7] Norbert Nussbaum, "Der Chorplan der Zisterzienserkirche Altenberg. Überlegungen zur Entwurfs- und Baupraxis im 13. Jahrhundert", in *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 64, 2003, p.7-52.

Fig. 2. Altenberg, former Cistercian Abbey Church, misaligned arcade piers in the choir polygon (Norbert Nussbaum)

In such transformative procedures there must have been conventions for translating geometries into modular systems or forming coherent systems from these two components. This can be shown convincingly in the proportions of the Altenberg tracery windows, which by necessity are designed geometrically, but which had to be integrated into the modularly determined proportions of the building's elevation (Fig. 3).

The height of the windows and the main levels of their tracery can all be derived from the width of the windows by means of geometric operations. The lancet axes, moreover, create a strict grid that establishes both the centres and the radii of the circles used to construct the window heads. Each distinct window design resulted from a different solution within the basic framework of this system. But because the overall elevation is set by a strictly modular system involving the heights of the piers and the sills, the interior articulation of the windows is also integrated into the modular order of the overall design. These linkages, however, vary from window type to window type. Some kind of connection was clearly seen as desirable, but the character of the coupling depended on the possibilities afforded by the specific geometry of each window.

In the great window of the north transept frontal, the overall height is set by the stacking of two rotated squares, whose side length in each case equals the width of the window. The springing points of the main window arch and its lancets, however, are set by multiples of the relevant foot unit

37 ft.
28 ft.
30 ft.

Fig. 3. Altenberg, former Cistercian Abbey Church, proportions of tracery windows (Norbert Nussbaum): a. Main window of the north transept frontal. b. Main window of the west façade

(37 and 28 modules, respectively). And in the superb window of the west facade, the height of the lancets is set by a proportioning figure based on the window width, while the springing point of the whole window is established 30 modules above its sill.

The interaction between geometrical and modular design strategies in these cases does not function as a single ideal system that gives the key to the whole composition, as older research on Gothic building geometry had suggested.[8] Instead, this interaction helps to establish the proportions and placement of divergent formal systems within a modularly articulated building structure. The modules give objectively measurable intended values for the reference levels of the window geometries, thereby locking the windows into the overall proportion of the elevation. In cases of non-textual information transfer, the establishment of such values provides an objective check on the accuracy of translation from the design phase to the building phase. These values, therefore, are traces of a quality-control process connecting the manual labor of construction back to the formal logic of the original design.

[8] For an example of this trend, see Edgar Wedepohl, *Eumetria: das Glück der Proportionen. Massgrund und Grundmass in der Baugeschichte*, Essen, 1967.

a. b. c. d.

Fig. 4. Altenberg, former Cistercian Abbey Church, joint structure of the tracery windows of the choir aisles (Norbert Nussbaum):
a. Blind window of a radial chapel. b. Window of the north aisle. c. and d. Window of the north transept aisle

Information about building techniques was not readily transmitted from place to place in this manner. As a general rule, specifications about points of junction, for example the way a tracery structure is assembled of different interacting pieces, or the way the courses of masonry are laid out in correspondence to adjacent elements - occur neither in parchment design drawings nor in incised drawings on building surfaces. And this makes good sense, because even the most conventional formal relationships often have to be modified to account for the particular character of materials and the conditions of installation. In other words: while the use of drawings doubtless encouraged the standardization of Gothic formal systems, analogous standardization of technical practices was undermined both by the diversity of material conditions and by the lack of appropriate media of communication. The transfer of technical knowledge thus tended to involve the principle of trial and error.

Systems of Normative Form and Technical Empiricism

The process of transfer with modification can be seen in the case of the tracery motif of stacked trefoils, which was transmitted from the great buildings of the Paris basin through the Cologne Cathedral workshop to Altenberg, where the joint structure was modified to create tracery with more conveniently sized pieces that were sturdy and able to bear structural loads (Fig. 4)[9]. And within the same basic architectural culture even simpler stone jointing patterns could be treated in a variety of ways. The connection between window frames and the adjacent buttresses provides a good illustration of this principle. In the radiating chapels of Beauvais Cathedral, the same course heights were chosen, so far as possible, for the frames and the supports (Fig. 5a). The drip mouldings on the buttresses have staggered joints, however, because the edges of the profiles would otherwise fall too close to the course above, and the system also breaks down at each level where the frames of the window heads intrude with their own joint pattern. At Cologne Cathedral, a building that has much in common with Beauvais in formal terms, the frames and buttresses are built as completely independent stacks, each with its own joint structure (Fig. 5b). Yet another system appears at the Wernerkapelle in Bacharach, whose articulation generally follows the traditions of the Cologne lodge. In this case the stones of the frame lock into the buttresses with mostly staggered joints (Fig. 5c). All three jointing systems have technical and constructional advantages and disadvantages that I will not discuss here. What matters more in the present context is contrast between formal continuity, on the one hand, and technical variety, on the other.

These observations do not diminish the contribution of Dieter Kimpel, who more than thirty years ago set out a theory of Gothic technological development claiming that architects in the thirteenth century sought to standardize coursing patterns in the masonry of entire buildings by establishing continuous horizontal joints. It has become obvious in the meantime that this attempt to match the entelechy of formal style with a comparable model of technical style does not conform precisely to reality, but the rejection of such models cannot be the best way forward. Yet the discipline of building archaeology has generally neglected broad interpretive models. Unlike art history, which emphasizes comparison and the construction of complete explanatory narratives, the field remains fixated on building monographs to an almost obsessive extent. Now more than ever, though, we need a richer and more nuanced historiography of Gothic building practice and its intellectual foundations.

[9] Sabine Lepsky & Norbert Nussbaum, *Gotische Konstruktion und Baupraxis an der Zisterzienserkirche Altenberg*, Vol. 1 (Die Choranlage), Bergisch Gladbach, 2005, p.192-193.

a

c

b

Fig. 5. Connection between window frames and the adjacent buttresses (Norbert Nussbaum): a. Beauvais Cathedral, radiating chapel. b. Cologne Cathedral, radiating chapel. c. Bacharach, Wernerkapelle

Since design drawings included somewhat less detail than would be necessary to fully specify all the technical details of construction, and since the patterns of reception for formal and technical ideas were therefore somewhat independent of one another, it seems that we should speak of direct connections between workshops only in those cases where the technical and operational solutions converge. Gothic architectural culture should be understood as a professional network that permitted the long-distance transmission of knowledge about formal solutions through the medium of drawing, while still depending to a large degree on the mediating presence of the builders themselves. The regulations governing the training of apprentices through travel as journeymen, which would go on to form the core of the Regensburg Masons' ordinances of 1459, sought to give an institutional framework to this transfer of knowledge.

A Medieval Ground Plan of the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach: Plan Number 6 verso in the Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame at Strasbourg[1]

Yves Gallet

On the occasion of the British Archaeological Association Conference at Mainz, in 2003, Paul Crossley presented a paper on the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach, one of the most captivating buildings in the Rhine Valley, between Bingen and Koblenz. With his customary brilliance, he collected a wealth of evidence based as much on an archaeological analysis of the building as on the topography of liturgy, the *histoire des mentalités*, the geography of styles, or the study of the transmission of artistic creation.[2] It is, therefore, a particular pleasure to dedicate this brief essay to him. The idea of it was born while researching a different subject, the drawings of the cathedral of Strasbourg. I hope it will contribute to enrich the knowledge of a monument that he himself has always passionately loved and studied.

***

The plan that interests us here (Fig. 1) comes from the collection of the Strasbourg Cathedral lodge and is preserved today in the Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame. The drawing is traced with ink on a parchment of 66 x 27.5 cm. Together with other pieces of parchment, the drawing forms the verso of a much larger drawing, n° 6 recto, representing an elevation of the façade of Strasbourg Cathedral (244.5 x 95.5 cm).

It was as late as 1989, on the occasion of the exhibition *Les bâtisseurs des cathédrales gothiques*, that the existence of the drawing was revealed. Roland Recht, the first author to publish it, gave it the title "ground plan of a transept and of a choir" and described it as follows:

> "Until now, only the recto of the plan was known. On the occasion of a recent examination, we discovered on the verso the ground plan of the eastern part of a church (transept and choir). […] The plan consists of a transept of which only the eastern half can be seen: the south arm is two rectangular bays deep and ends in a straight line, the north side is only one bay long and terminates with a five-part apse. The choir, also made of five parts, is directly attached to the crossing. The buttresses, equipped with pinnacles, are aligned with the ribs. The profile of the piers, the thickness of the walls and the disposition of the pinnacles suggest a building from the late fourteenth or from the fifteenth century. […] Nothing allows us to think that the plan was intended for the Strasbourg building site: its size speaks strongly against the hypothesis that the drawing might represent a projected replacement for the Romanesque choir of the cathedral".[3]

[1] I would like to thank Cécile Dupeux, Conservatrice of the Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame and Barbara Gatineau, Assistante de Conservation, for their help in Strasbourg, and Alexandra Gajewski for her critical reading and translation of the paper.

[2] Paul Crossley, "The Wernerkapelle in Bacharach", in *Mainz and the Middle Rhine Valley. Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. Alexandra Gajewski & Ute Engel (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 30), Leeds, 2007, p. 167-192.

[3] Roland Recht, entry C8 in Roland Recht ed., *Les bâtisseurs des cathédrales gothiques*, Strasbourg, 1989, p. 398-399: "On ne connaissait jusqu'à présent que le recto de ce dessin; à l'occasion d'un examen récent, nous avons dégagé au verso le plan de la partie orientale d'une église (transept et chœur). […] Le plan est composé d'un transept dont on ne voit que la moitié orientale : le bras sud, profond de deux travées barlongues, est arrêté par une ligne droite, le côté nord est long d'une seule travée et terminé par une abside à cinq pans. Le chœur, à cinq pans également, est directement attaché à la croisée. Les contreforts munis de pinacles sont placés dans l'axe des ogives. Le profil des piles, l'épaisseur des murs et la disposition des pinacles évoquent un édifice de la fin du XIVe siècle ou du XVe siècle. […] Rien ne nous permet de supposer que ce plan était destiné au chantier strasbourgeois : son échelle rend peu vraisemblable l'hypothèse selon laquelle il aurait pu être réalisé en remplacement du chœur roman de la cathédrale."

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100137

Fig. 1. Strasbourg, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame, plan n° 6 (D-22-995-0-15) verso, brown ink on parchment, 66 x 27,5 cm (Strasbourg, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame)

It is clear, therefore, that Recht interprets the short apse as the design of an east end and the lateral extensions as the arms of a transept: that is to say, and correcting the slip of the author who seems to have inversed north and south here, that the two rectangular bays to the left of the apse are part of a north transept, and the rectangular bay with the polygonal semi-apse shown on the right form a south transept. For Recht, we are looking at an incomplete ground-plan, representing only the eastern parts of a church.

This interpretation seems to have suggested itself to the author on account of an underlying comparison with the cathedral of Strasbourg where the late twelfth-century apse joins directly with the crossing of the transept. It is by reconstituting this non-explicit step in Recht's reasoning that we should perhaps understand the last lines of the commentary and the emphasis he places on excluding the idea that the plan might have been intended for the reconstruction of the eastern parts of Strasbourg Cathedral.

The interpretation proposed by Recht leaves a certain number of open questions. The first concerns the asymmetrical lay-out of the supposed transept, with the northern arm consisting of two straight bays, while the other, to the south, terminates with a polygonal apse: buildings constructed on such a plan are rare, and where a comparable case is known – as at the cathedral of Soissons –, it was as a result of changes and not of a single project. Moreover, why is only the eastern side of the transept shown on the drawing? Assuming it represents the project for a partial reconstruction of a building, the juncture with an older nave to the west would have caused as much if not more problems. Finally, why does the drawing show no limit on the far north of the transept (there is no clear indication of a wall in that place), as if the north transept might still continue for one or two additional bays?

In these circumstances, a different reading of the ground plan could perhaps be proposed. It requires turning the plan 90 degrees anti-clockwise, so that the east end corresponds to the semi-apse of what Recht interpreted as the south transept. The supposed northern arm of the transept thus becomes a nave of two bays, the five-part apse becomes the northern arm of the transept, and the former south transept can now be read as a chevet, consisting of a straight bay and a polygonal apse. The straight line delimiting the drawing, which Recht took to be a north-south line, now reveals itself as an east-west axis which, by symmetry, allows completing the ground-plan of the building. It was cus-

Fig. 2. Restitution, by axial symmetry, of the drawing on plan n° 6 verso (Yves Gallet)

tomary for master masons in this period to depict only half of a symmetrical plan and the Strasbourg lodge offers good examples of this practice, starting from the years 1250-1255.[4]

Thus reconstituted, the ground plan shows a church consisting of a short nave of two rectangular bays, a transept the arms of which are reduced to two lateral apses, and a chevet composed of one straight bay and a polygonal apse (Fig. 2). This apse, together with the transept, links our building with a family of chevets built on a three-conch plan. Well known in the north of France and in Belgium (the cathedrals of Noyon, Cambrai, Tournai), this family is also largely represented in the Empire, particularly in the Rhineland, during the Romanesque period (in Cologne: St. Maria im Kapitol, Groß St. Martin, St. Georg, St. Aposteln; in Bonn the cathedral of St Martin; Schwarzrheindorf, etc.), even from the Carolingian period (Werden), and up to the thirteenth century (St Andreas in Cologne, St Elisabeth in Marburg, Our Lady in Frankenberg (Eder)). It is also the plan chosen for one of the most important royal foundations in fourteenth-century Moravia: the Cistercian monastery at Brno, founded by Queen Eliška Rejčka (also known as Elizabeth Richenza), wife of the Polish and Bohemian king

[4] On plan A, only the half of the south facade was shown, and the majority of plans that followed were conceived in the same way.

Fig. 3 Bacharach, Wernerkapelle, ground-plan (after Paul Crossley, “The Wernerkapelle in Bacharach”, in *Mainz and the Middle Rhine Valley. Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. Ute Engel & Alexandra Gajewski (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 30), Leeds, 2007, with corrections by Yves Gallet)

Wenceslas II (1283-1305), in 1323. [5] But only a single building adopted the plan shown on the drawing of Strasbourg: the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach, begun in 1287-1289 (Fig. 3).

***

The most striking similarities between the chapel at Bacharach and the Strasbourg plan concern first of all the ground level, with the exception of the two western bays to which we shall return later. East of the nave, the Wernerkapelle presents effectively a transept composed of a square crossing

[5] Jan Sedlák, “Die Architektur in Mähren in der Zeit der Luxemburger”, *Die Parler und der Schöne Stil 1350-1400. Europäische Kunst unter den Luxemburgern*, ed. Anton Legner, vol. 5, Cologne, 1980, p. 123-136, 124. Klára Benešovská, “Aula Sanctae Mariae, abbaye cistercienne féminine de fondation royale. Brno, République Tchèque“, in *Cîteaux et les femmes*, ed. Bernadette Barrière & Marie-Elisabeth Henneau, Paris, 2001, p. 55-71. Klára Benešovská & Dušan Foltýn, “Brno - Staré Brno. Bývalý klášter cisterciaček Aula S. Mariae, v současnosti konvent obutých augustiniánů s kostelem Nanebevzetí P. Marie, basilikou minor“, in *Encyklopedie moravských a slezských klášterů*, ed. Dušan Foltýn et al., Prague, 2005, p. 208-215.

Fig. 4 Attempt to superimpose plan n° 6 verso (after restitution) onto the ground-plan of the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach (Yves Gallet)

and two polygonal, five-sided apses to either side, and to the east a chevet consisting of a short straight bay and a five-sided apse. The proportions are also very close, to the extent that the building can be almost exactly superimposed onto the plan from Strasbourg (Fig. 4).

Looking more carefully into the details, other similarities become patently obvious. They concern the distribution of the buttresses, with notably the presence of a diagonally set buttress in the re-entrant angles between the nave and the transept apse and between that same apse and the straight bay of the chevet, a rare feature that can be found, for example, at St Elisabeth at Marburg, but not in the church at Frankenberg, despite the fact that the latter was started in 1286[6] and is thus chronologically closer to Bacharach. One could also mention the implantation of the pinnacles that top the buttresses. As indicated with precision on the Strasbourg plan, the lower set of pinnacles that top the outer pier buttresses are set at an angle with the rectangular plan of the buttresses, while the upper pinnacles that top the inner pier buttresses and break through the eaves, are set straight. This corresponds to the system at Bacharach, at least that of the transept and the straight bay of the choir.

The differences between the plan and the building as it was constructed seem to relate only to details, mainly concerning the chevet. At Bacharach, the straight bay of the choir is less deep. This is

[6] Gerhard Ringshausen, "Frankenberg", in Legner, *Die Parler und der Schöne Stil* (see note 5), vol. 1, p. 230-231 ; Marc Carel Schurr, *Gotische Architektur im mittleren Europa 1220-1340*, Munich & Berlin, 2007, p. 128-129.

exactly the position where, on the drawing, Recht had noticed a "de-centering of the key-stone".[7] Furthermore, three of the four buttresses of the eastern apse are decorated with blind arcading. As Crossley himself has rightly underlined, there was an intention to embellish this part of the building.[8] By contrast, on the Strasbourg plan, all the sides of thebuttresses have flat surfaces. As if in accordance with the distinctive treatment of the buttresses at Bacharach, some of the upper choir pinnacles around the apse and along the north side of the choir bay are set at an angle while on the Strasbourg plan they are all straight. Finally, in the chevet of Bacharach, the windows of the turning bays of the apse are decorated with four lancets, while on the Strasbourg plan all the windows of the chevet (apse and straight bays) are shown with three lancets.

Other modifications seem to be linked to the internal circulation in the church and to the provision of access. On the Strasbourg plan, all sides of the terminal apses of the transept are treated identically. At Bacharach, only the south transept resembles the plan since the disposition of the north transept apse was slightly different: in fact, a portal was inserted into the fourth turning bay from the west, allowing access into the chapel; today only the eastern jamb survives (the other was demolished in 1752, together with the rest of the north transept). The easternmost side of the apse, contiguous with the surviving jamb, consists of solid masonry, pierced only by a small window next to the north-east angle of the crossing; on the Strasbourg drawing, that bay was pierced with a double-lancet window. It cannot be excluded, however, that the author of the Strasbourg plan may have anticipated the use of the eastern side of the apse as an entrance since he seems to have subtly bent the apse in an eastern or north-eastern direction, and thus towards the approaching pilgrims. Surprisingly, in fact, a line traced from the key-stone of the crossing to that of the transept apse does not pass through the centre of the axial side of the apse, that is to say through the middle of the central lancet of the three-light window, but slightly to the left. The result of this almost imperceptible rotation is the deformation of the first western bay of the transept, which does not join with the nave at a right angle.

Despite these differences, the analogies between the finished building and the plan remain remarkable.[9] No other known building shows as many similarities with the plan, which invites us to identify the Strasbourg plan as a ground plan of the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach.

***

Before discussing the original function of the design (whether it represents a project, a design ready for execution, a drawing of the completed building, a study drawing, a copy of a drawing, etc.) in relation to the finished building, it is important to underline the contribution this document makes to our knowledge of the chapel. The discussion will concentrate here on the western parts, since, at Bacharach, they were not built before the fifteenth century, after a long break in the construction campaign. As Paul Crossley recalled, work had started in the south transept, to which the earthly remains of young Werner were transferred probably as early as 1293. They continued with the chevet, followed by the north transept; around 1300, that part of the building was already in service.[10] But work stopped in the early fourteenth century. It was not to continue until the process of canonization got under way, after 1426. Then the western block was built, composed of two square bays supporting a tribune, and at the same time the whole church was vaulted.[11] The Strasbourg plan, on the other

[7] "Ce plan montre des inexactitudes, comme par exemple le décentrement de la clé dans la travée barlongue du croisillon sud" (Recht, *Les bâtisseurs* (see note 3), p. 399). What Recht interprets as the south transept corresponds to what we identify as the chevet.

[8] Crossley, "The Wernerkapelle" (see note 2), p. 175-176.

[9] Moreover, Nussbaum's analysis of the Wernerkapelle in Bacharach starts with the discussion of the idiosyncratic ground plan (Norbert Nussbaum, *German Gothic Church Architecture*, New Haven & London, 2000, p. 60).

[10] Crossley, "The Wernerkapelle" (see note 2), p. 170-172.

[11] *Ibidem*, p. 172-175.

[12] Otto Kletzl, "Ein Werkriß des Frauenhauses von Straßburg", in *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*,

hand, shows a nave of two rectangular bays and nothing allows us to think that there was to be a tribune. Thus, the architecture appears more balanced between the eastern parts, where the apse is preceded by a straight bay, and the western parts. Since the drawing does not show a clear limitation in the west, it is even tempting to suggest that the nave might have been intended to have more bays than the two that are shown.

This brings us finally to the question of the function of the Strasbourg design, which raises delicate problems of interpretation and dating. Could this be a plan of the existing building? Probably not, since otherwise the drawing would be more faithful to the Bacharach chapel and it would not show all the differences of detail that were discussed above. Besides, the bays of the nave had not yet been built and could not have been drawn. It is also unlikely that the elements positioned up high, and consequently hardly accessible, such as the pinnacles of the buttresses or the keystones of the vaults, could have been drawn with the precision with which they are indicated on the drawing. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the north transept with the portal is not the symmetrical equivalent of the south transept, which has no portal, and the buttresses with blind arcading are not arranged symmetrically around the apse of the chevet. Had this been the plan of the finished building, undoubtedly the draftsman would not have chosen to represent only half of the building. The other plans that we know with certainty to represent existing buildings, such as plan 21 in the Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame, which shows, on the recto, the ground plan of the chevet of Notre-Dame in Paris and, on the verso, that of Orléans Cathedral, all show the complete building.[12]

Perhaps, we are looking at a project for the chapel of Bacharach? In that case, the differences between the plan and the building can be explained, admitting that the plan represents a preliminary sketch and not a design intended for execution. This would also justify both the fact that the drawing is limited to only half the plan as well as the designer's omission to represent a western façade and to clearly indicate the location of the portal. During construction, it became necessary to make certain adjustments to the plan taking into account, for example, the irregular topography of the site at Bacharach and the path that was to allow access to the church from the north transept. The nature of a preliminary sketch would equally account for the designer's interest in the details, such as the pinnacles and the key-stones that are drawn in a precise and meticulous manner.

In turn, that explanation raises a problem regarding the dating. If the drawing represents a project or a preliminary sketch, it needs to be dated to the years 1287-1289, between the death of young Werner and the actual start of the construction. However, that dating seems to contradict the fact that the plan has been drawn on the verso of a parchment, the recto of which shows an elevation of the façade of Strasbourg Cathedral. Recht noted that the drawing of Bacharach "continues onto the second piece of parchment", which can only mean that "it [the drawing] postdates the assembly of the pieces which served as a support for the elevation on the recto".[13] Since that elevation represents the story at belfry level, between the main towers, it must date to the second half of the fourteenth century. Otto Kletzl proposed a date in the years 1388-1399 and suggested the elevation of the façade was drawn under the supervision of Claus von Lohre.[14] More recently, Roland Recht suggested that the construction of

11, 1938-1939, p. 1-56 ; Yves Gallet, "Le dessin n° 21 de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame : un projet de chevet gothique pour la cathédrale de Strasbourg ?", in *Bulletin de la Société des Amis de la Cathédrale de Strasbourg*, 29, 2010, p. 115-146.

[13] Recht, *Les bâtisseurs* (see note 3), p. 399: "…qu'il empiète sur le second morceau de parchemin […] qu'il est postérieur au montage des morceaux qui ont servi de support à l'élévation du recto."

[14] Otto Kletzl, *Die Junker von Prag in Straßburg*, Frankfurt, 1936; Kletzl, *Plan-Fragmente aus der deutschen Dombauhütte von Prag in Stuttgart und Ulm* (Veröffentlichungen des Archivs der Stadt Stuttgart, 3), Stuttgart, 1939.

the belfry could have started as early as 1383, coinciding with the arrival of Michael of Freiburg.[15] Therefore, it could be argued that plan n° 6 recto dates back as far as the early 1380s rather than the following decade, especially since, in comparison with the completed façade, the drawing reveals a number of differences of detail.[16] But all this does not fundamentally change the fact that the plan on the verso must have been executed late, around a century after the start of the construction at Bacharach.

While I am awaiting first hand verification of the material evidence in order to confirm Recht's observations (because of its large size, the complex procedure of taking out plan n° 6 and removing it from its frame could not be effected within the deadlines of this publication), the only possibility of reconciling these different facts is to admit – provisionally – that the Strasbourg plan is, at the earliest, a late fourteenth-century copy of a plan conceived in the years 1287-1289 for the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach. The modest dimensions of the design (66 x 27.5 cm) also speak in favour of the idea of a copy on a reduced scale. By contrast, it is not easy to see what the purpose of such a copy might have been.[17]

***

There remains the question of the location: if plan n° 6 verso is a copy, nothing is known about the lost original; we do not know where it came from or how it ended up in Strasbourg. The possibility that the original plan was drawn in the Strasbourg lodge cannot be totally ruled out. However, it could have been brought to Strasbourg in the same way as plans of Strasbourg, Cologne and Prague came to be stored in Vienna, Ulm, Freiburg, Bern, Nuremberg, etc. There is also the possibility that the Strasbourg lodge had a particular link with the building site at Bacharach. Plan n° 6 verso itself was evidently made at Strasbourg, and probably in the cathedral lodge, because of the elevation of the Strasbourg façade drawn on the recto of the parchment. Since the façade was under construction by then, the parchment has never left the city.

In any case, this issue raises the question of the stylistic affiliation of the Wernerkapelle, traditionally connected with the two great artistic foyers of the region, Strasbourg and Cologne. In the past, authors have defined the influences as coming either from one or the other or, on occasion, also from third foyers, such as Trier.[18] In his 2003 study, Crossley clearly exposed the problematic nature of the evidence. Situating Bacharach stylistically between the classicism of Cologne and the mannerism of Strasbourg, he recalled the chapel's historically ambiguous situation: it was, at the same time, part of

[15] Roland Recht, *L'Alsace gothique de 1300 à 1365 : Etude d'architecture religieuse*, Colmar, 1974, p. 72-80. However, Hans Reinhardt argued that Michael's of Freiburg period of activity was marked mostly by the necessity to repair the damages to the cathedral caused by the fire of 1384 (Hans Reinhardt, *La cathédrale de Strasbourg*, Paris, 1972, p. 22-23 and 82). On the belfry of Strasbourg: Bruno Klein, "Der Fassadenplan 5 für das Strassburger Münster und der Beginn des fiktiven Architekturentwurfes", in ed. Stefanie Lieb, *Form und Stil: Festschrift für Günther Binding zum 65. Geburtstag*, Darmstadt, 2001, p. 166-174, and Denise Borlée, "Le beffroi de la cathédrale de Strasbourg, un singulier aménagement de la fin du XIVe siècle", in ed. Philippe Lorentz & Cécile Dupeux, *Strasbourg 1400 : Un foyer d'art dans l'Europe gothique*, Strasbourg, 2007, p. 80-93.

[16] On the second story of the tower, the plan shows arcading consisting of four lancets between two smaller lancets, while the facade has six lancets of the same size. On the third story, the window tracery of the present tower is composed of two lancets framing a smaller lancet and topped with a cinquefoil, while on the plan it is composed of three equal lancets subdivided into six smaller, secondary lancets, and above two large and one small stacked oculi. The tracery of the belfry window also differs, as does the parapet of the upper platform. Most of the differences have already been noticed by Recht, *Les bâtisseurs* (see note 3), p. 398.

[17] Among the various conceivable explanations, it is possible to imagine that the plan is a simple study sketch. Still, it seems highly surprising that someone should copy a plan that is already some hundred years old and of a building that must therefore have seemed outmoded. If the late dating, to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, can be confirmed, one could perhaps consider whether the plan was not made with a view to re-launching the construction campaign.

[18] Nussbaum, *German Gothic* (see note 9), p. 60.

the diocese of Trier and the possession of the chapter of St Andreas at Cologne. Following with some nuances the theory of Hartmut Seeliger, according to which Bacharach depended stylistically on an architectural workshop within Mainz itself, mid-way between Strasbourg and Cologne,[19] Crossley proposed to reattribute a role to Cologne and the influence it exerted through the circulation of master masons, architectural drawings, or through micro-architecture. [20]

In this context, the question of the origin of the plan preserved at Strasbourg is undoubtedly significant. The answer can only be a cautious one. As Crossley underlined, the polarisation of the debate about the stylistic background of the Bacharach chapel around Strasbourg and Cologne should be renounced in favour of a more nuanced vision which takes into account the multiplication of building sites and foyers of the Rayonnant style in the whole of the eastern Empire.[21] In these circumstances, I will only allow myself one observation: the fact that all the windows of the chevet were planned as three-light windows, more common at Strasbourg than at Cologne, could be interpreted as an indication in favour of a Strasbourg origin. Without going as far as to propose an attribution, it is interesting to note that the elaboration of the Bacharach project, in the years 1287-1289 corresponds, at Strasbourg, to the period when the famous Master Erwin (1284-1318) was active. On the other hand, the fact that the window design was modified between the project and the completed chapel to include four-light windows, almost systematically used on the building site of the Cologne façade, could be a sign for a Cologne-trained master taking over the site at Bacharach. Undoubtedly, this will be a point to meditate or discuss in the future.

***

Beyond the comments that can be ventured on the subject of the geography of Rayonnant Gothic in the Rhineland, I may be permitted to insist on the principal argument put forward in this essay, which links the Strasbourg plan with one the of the most picturesque ruins along the romantic Rhine, the Wernerkapelle at Bacharach. The Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame gains the identification of a plan which, from now on, can no longer be considered as a project for the reconstruction of the chevet of Strasbourg Cathedral. In this respect, the intuition of Recht, who first discovered the previously unknown plan, is thus fully confirmed. This new piece of evidence added to the Bacharach dossier also reinforces the interest in this beautiful chapel, the richness of which Paul Crossley has already demonstrated. Finally, the example of the plan also allows us to connect the Bacharach chapel with the problems an increasing number of scholars face today and which concern, next to the history of the buildings themselves, the history of architectural projects, sometimes realised, at other times abandoned. Once confined to a few abundantly documented key monuments, such as the façades of Strasbourg and Cologne, research extends today to smaller buildings. Increasingly, fresh insights allow us to appreciate the inflexions between the project and the final state, that is to say, touch on that part of the dream which the architect laid down on parchment, without always having the possibility to turn it into physical reality. From this viewpoint, the case of Bacharach is emblematic.

Translated and edited by Alexandra Gajewski

[19] Hartmut SEELIGER, "Die Stadtkirche in Friedberg in Hessen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der gotischen Baukunst in Hessen und am Mittelrhein", in *Archiv für hessische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, n.s. 27, 1961-1962, p. 33-88.

[20] CROSSLEY, "The Wernerkapelle", (see note 2), p. 178-185.

[21] *Ibidem*, p. 179-180.

Wenceslas IV and the Chapel of Corpus Christi in the New Town of Prague*

Klára Benešovská and Zoë Opačić

A corollary of the enduring image of the Bohemian King and the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire Wenceslas IV (1378-1419) as a politically indecisive, dilatory and altogether incapable ruler, who lost not only his authority in the empire but also the crown itself, and who in his own kingdom proved unable to confront the onset of the church reform movement, is the perception of his lack of interest in public affairs and a refuge from regal duties into the world of personal pursuits and courtly pleasures (Fig. 1). This characterisation of Wenceslas IV presents him as opposite to his great father, Charles IV (1347-1378), whose successful reign he was unable to continue, in contrast to his younger and more able brother Sigismund of Luxembourg (1387-1437).[1]

That oversimplified and generalised picture does not take into account the development of Wenceslas's personality in the course of his reign, or the path shaped by the contemporary political context and by the pressure placed on him to react to dramatic changes in domestic and international politics.

1378 to 1383 can be seen to be the decisive years, during which Wenceslas IV's liberal and forward-looking programme was formed to a large degree, and his image as a "good ruler" was actively constructed. At the same time, during those first five years of his reign Wenceslas came up against the rocky obstacles of imperial politics and the limits of his own powers. He ascended the Bohemian and imperial thrones after his father's death, in a politically complex period dominated by the papal schism,

* Dedicated to Paul Crossley - who has brought the authors of this article together and has introduced medieval Prague into the mainstream of English-speaking scholarship through his teaching and publications - with gratitude, admiration and affection. Many thanks also to Alexandra Gajewski, Christopher Masters and Achim Timmermann for their helpful suggestions and comments.

[1] The stereotype of undeserving son, cast in the shadow of his exceptional father is frequently encountered in the historiography of other European ruling dynasties. Its Old Testament archetype is Solomon and his son Roboam. The characterisation of incapable Wenceslas, responsible for the breakout of the Hussite revolution, was initiated by the abbot of the Silesian monastery in Żagań, Ludolf von Sagan, soon after 1420, and it was taken up by the Catholics in and outside Bohemia; in some historical writing that view still persists today. On this subject see, Franz Machilek, *Ludolf von Sagan und seine Stellung in der Auseinandersetzung um Konziliarismus und Hussitismus*, Munich, 1967, p. 137-146. Petr Čornej, "Dvojí tvář Václava IV.", in Petr Čornej, *Tajemství českých kronik. Cesty ke kořenům husitské tradice*, Prague & Litomyšl, 2003, p. 67-116. For the discussion of the negative assessment of the reign of Wenceslas IV see most recently Robert Novotný, "Ráj milců? Nižší šlechta na dvoře Václava IV.", in *Skladba a kultura dvorské společnosti II: Dvory a rezidence ve středověku*, ed. Dana Dvořáčková-Malá & Jan Zelenka (Medievalia Historica Bohemica, Supplementum 2), Prague, 2008, p. 215-227. Petra Roschek, "König Wenzel IV. – Opfer einer schwarzen Legende und ihrer Strahlkraft", in *Regionen Europas – Europa der Regionen. Festschrift für Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Thorau, Sabine Penth & Rüdiger Fuchs, Cologne, 2003, p. 207-229. Peter Moraw, "König Wenzels (1378-1419) Hof, eine Günstlingswirtschaft?", in *Der Fall des Günstlings. Hofparteien in Europa vom 13. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert,* ed. Jan Hirschbigel & Werner Paravacini (Residenzforschung, 17), Ostfildern, 2004, p. 163-175.
Among the fundamental Czech studies of Wenceslas IV's era we should mention above all Jiří Spěváček, *Václav IV. 1361-1419. K předpokladům husitské revoluce*, Prague, 1986; Ivan Hlaváček, "Das Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen des böhmischen und römischen Königs Wenzel IV.", in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Schriften*, 23, Stuttgart, 1969 ; Ivan Hlaváček , "Wenzel IV., sein Hof und seine Königsherrschaft vornehmlich über Böhmen", in *Das spätmittelalterliche Königtum im europäischen Vergleich* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 32), ed. Reinhard Schneider, Sigmaringen, 1991, p. 361-420; Lenka Bobková & Milena bartlová, *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české*, vol 4, part 1 and 2, Prague & Litomyšl, 2003; Petr Čornej, *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české*, vol. 5 *(1402-1437)*, Prague, 2000. On the Prague of Wenceslas IV's era see Václav Vladivoj Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy*, vol. 3, Prague, 1875.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100138

Fig. 1. Bust of Wenceslas IV on the sedilia, 1390s, Týn Church, Prague (Photo Daniela Vokounová, Ústav dějin umění, Akademie věd České republiky, Prague)

where the favouring of one or the other party could lead to a loss of support and prestige, and earn the animosity of either of the two camps. When in 1378, during the Frankfurt diet, Wenceslas and Archbishop Jan of Jenstein demonstrated support for Urban VI who urged the king to come to Rome, the French, who championed Clement VII, threatened to withdraw their support and were followed by those imperial cities who wished to benefit from the crisis at the expense of the electors. At the same time he could not lose sight of dynastic issues: for eleven years his brother Sigismund grappled (with Wenceslas's help) with the problematic reign of Hungary; following delicate diplomatic negotiations and a long journey via Flanders, his sister Anne was married to the English King Richard II in 1382, again to the irritation of the French.[2] Wenceslas also had to reinforce his standing in the Bohemian Crown Lands. Internationally, he needed peace in the Empire in order to embark on his coronation journey to Rome, and he endeavoured to secure a cessation of hostilities. He announced twelve years of universal peace in Nuremberg in spring of 1383, and despatched an embassy to Rome, led by the *magister curiae* Konrád Krajíř of Krajek (also known as Kreiger von Kreig) and 400 knights, who made it only as far as the court of Austrian Duke Leopold before the conflict between the imperial towns and electors escalated again. To add to all these challenges, Wenceslas's cousin, Louis II of Anjou (1377-1417), invaded southern Italy in an attempt to secure his Neapolitan inheritance following Queen Joanna's death in 1382, an act which only increased tensions in the peninsula.

In these circumstances a coronation journey to Rome was deemed too risky. In 1383 Wenceslas IV received at his castle of Žebrák a French delegation armed with letters proclaiming the legitimacy of Pope Clement VII, the claims Wenceslas had to acknowledge but which further complicated his intended Roman expedition.[3] The emperor appointed his cousin Jošt as an imperial envoy in Italy, so that his intentions on behalf of the Empire as well as the planned journey itself could be further negotiated. Meanwhile, Wenceslas increasingly focused his attention on the internal affairs of the kingdom. He became engaged in rebuilding old and founding new residences in royal towns as well as in the favourite royal hunting grounds, and surrounded himself with a new entourage from the ranks of lower nobility who frequently held sway over the royal councillors. Alongside the unpredictable and stormy situation in the Empire and in Italy, which forced the emperor to improvise continuously, the relative stability of the Bohemian Kingdom was also in jeopardy. 1383 marks the beginning of a deep conflict between the emperor and his former ally, Archbishop Jan of Jenstein, who maintained his support for Pope Urban VI, alienated himself from the royal council and worked to strengthen the independence of the Church anchored in ecclesiastical law. With hindsight, the year 1383 can be seen as the crucible of Wenceslas IV's reign. At the end of his first five years of independent rule, the 22-year-old monarch found himself at a crossroads: gradually moving away from his father's macro-politics towards internal affairs, both in his public, imperial-royal duties, and also on a personal level. It has to be recognised that a latent seam of that inner conflict was a longing for a revival of spiritual life, both inner and institutional, as we shall attempt to demonstrate with one example.

On 1 April 1382, 40 people gathered at the monastery of the Custodians of the Holy Sepulchre in Zderaz, west of Prague's New Town Square (*Forum Magnum*, now Charles Square), in order to place their seals on the founding charter of the confraternity that had undertaken the task of erecting the

[2] On the relationship between England and Bohemia at the time of the marriage of Richard II and Anne of Bohemia see most recently, Marek Suchý, "England and Bohemia in the time of Anne of Luxembourg: Dynastic Marriage as a Precondition for Cultural Contact in the Late Middle Ages", in *Prague and Bohemia. Medieval Art, Architecture and Cultural Exchange in Central Europe*, ed. Zoë Opačić (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 32), Leeds, 2009, p. 8-21.

[3] The fundamental importance of the Roman coronation journey for Wenceslas IV during this period, for which he prepared so meticulously that it became more of a theoretical than actual problem, is demonstrated by the treatise attached to the illuminated manuscript of the Golden Bull, commissioned by the king around 1400 and entitled: "*De habilitate temporis ad processum versus Italiam*". Armin Wolf, *König Wenzels Handschrift. Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe im Originalformat des Codex Vindobonensis 338 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, (Kommentar), Graz, 1977.

chapel of Corpus Christi for the veneration of the holiest body and blood of Christ, the Virgin and the holy martyrs Sts Felix and Adauct, "a glorious and costly work" situated in the middle of the square, "on the spot where relics of Christ's Passion and of many other saints are displayed every year" (*in medio fori novae civitatis Pragensis in loco, in quo reliquiae armorum domini Jesu Christi et aliorum plurimorum sanctorum...annuatim ostendi sunt consuetae*).[4]

Present on behalf of the Church were Mikuláš of Borotin (*magister curiae* of Archbishop Jan of Jenstein), the grand master of the order of Knights of the Cross with the Red Star, the provost of the Holy Sepulchre in Zderaz, the provost of the Dominicans at St Aegidius, the dean of the St Vitus Chapter and one of its canons, the dean of Vyšehrad (Wenceslas Králík of Buřenice, member of the royal council) and two of its canons. Among the 27 members of the nobility present were Wenceslas's "new men" from lower nobility as well as his councilors (Jan Čúch of Zásada, Markvart of Pořešín, Zdimír of Sedlec, Štěpán Poduška of Újezd), and lastly the representatives of the five most influential Prague clans (Jan Benešovský, Mikuláš Rot, Prokop Bohuslavův-Olbramovic, Pechanec Šibal, Dětřich Hošťálek). At the helm of the confraternity were three representatives or "captains" (*capitanei*) elected for one year. Any man could become a member providing he could afford to pay 300 Prague groschen, a large sum which in reality ensured access only to persons of means.[5]

Although neither the archbishop nor the king were among the founders, that is among those whose seals were appended to the charter,[6] both are unequivocally mentioned as having expressed their consent and will for the new foundation to be made.[7] The papal bull of 1391 again mentions royal consent for the new foundation,[8] and a further bull of 1397 explicitly refers to Wenceslas as a co-founder of the chapel alongside the *capitanei* and the members of the confraternity.[9]

The construction of the stone chapel is mentioned in sources in the two years after the foundation,[10] and the aforementioned bull of Boniface IX of 1391 talks of the threat that the already well-advanced new building could fall victim to the dispute with the priests of St Wenceslas's in Zderaz, in whose parish the new chapel stood and who demanded its demolition.[11] At that time, according to the papal correspondent's revealing description, the chapel had been constructed to a significant level (*satis alte*) and many pounds of silver had been spent on it. The pope entrusted the abbot of St Ambrose's with the arbitration of the dispute,[12] and since a bull of indulgences of 1393 lists the chapel among the churches where pilgrims were able to receive indulgences, it must have been to a large extent completed.[13] In this period it is referred to as *capella nova, ubi reliquiae* [...] *ostenduntur* (the new chapel where the relics... are displayed).[14] Finally the bull of Boniface IX of January 1397, addressed to Wen-

[4] *Monumenta historica universitatis Pragenae* vol. 2, part 1, p. 219-444, here p. 263. Václav Vladivoj TOMEK, *Základy místopisu pražského*, vol. 2, p. 26-27 and TOMEK, *Dějepis Prahy*, vol. 3, p. 202-204.

[5] The main study of the foundataion of the chapel is still Miloslav POLÍVKA, "K šíření husitství v Praze (Bratrstvo a kaple Božího těla na Novém Městě pražském v předhusitské době)", in *Folia historica bohemica*, 5, 1983, p. 95-118.

[6] POLÍVKA cautions that the Church representatives interested in the legal position and property rights of the chapel were not necessarily the founding members of the Confraternity; *ibidem*, p. 98.

[7] Antonín DITTRICH & Antonín Ferdinand SPIRK, *Monumenta historica universitatis Carolo-Ferdinandae Pragensis*, vol. 2, part 1, p. 263.

[8] Kamil KROFTA (ed.), *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia* [henceforth *MVB*], vol. 5, part 1, Prague 1903-1905, p. 267, no. 482.

[9] *MVB*, vol. 5, part 2, p. 596, no. 1074, p. 665, no. 1232, p. 670, no. 1239.

[10] Some of the fines of the ecclesiastical court from year 1383 and 1384 were awarded to the building of the new chapel. Kamil KROFTA, "Nové zprávy o někdejším kostele Božího Těla", in *Method*, 28, 1902, p. 108-109.

[11] KROFTA, "Nové zprávy", p. 109. In 1383, Hostislav, canon of Zderaz monastery and parish priest of St Wenceslas's, refused to give permission for the building work on the land of his parish. The founders of Corpus Christi eventually settled the dispute by donating 180 Prague groschen to the parish; however, in 1389 Hostislav's successor denied the legitimacy of the agreement and demanded a higher payment.

[12] *MVB*, vol. 5, part 1, p. 267, no. 482.

[13] *MVB*, vol. 5, part 1, p. 378-381, no. 669.

[14] TOMEK, *Základy*, vol 2, p. 26.

Fig. 2. Panorama of Prague, detail of the New Town's Charles Square showing Corpus Christi Chapel in the middle, the town hall and the market hall to its left, and the church of St Stephen with the rotunda of St Longinus above left; circa 1600, drawing by Johannes Wechter after Philip van den Bossche, published by Aegidius Sadeler (1606) (Ústav dějin umění, Akademie věd České republiky, Prague)

ceslas IV and the heads and members of the Confraternity, talks of a chapel with consecrated altars, built in a form of a square tower, where the relics are to be displayed as they were from a wooden tower previously erected by Charles IV, which this structure had replaced.[15]

The relic ceremony in question was one of the high-points in Prague's religious calendar, probably as early as 1350 when the Passion relics and imperial insignia were ceremoniously brought to Prague from Munich, but officially from 1354 when the Feast of the Holy Lance and Nails (*Festum Lancea et Clavium*) was celebrated annually on the second Friday after Easter.[16] The new feast was one of the central planks of Charles IV's religious policy: the relics that he generously donated to the cathedral and the city's other religious institutions during his reign had enriched the spiritual fabric of the aspiring imperial capital but the new feast created a special aura of sanctity as well as a unique annual spectacle. From 1365, the imperial treasure – a collection of ancient imperial insignia and a set of the Passion relics including the Holy Lance – were brought from their permanent repository in Karlstein Castle to the New Town and exhibited to the gathered crowds in a carefully staged liturgical event.[17]

The stage for this outdoor devotional theatre was the impressive Charles Square; indeed it could be argued that the square's size and location, as well as many other aspects of Charles IV's ambitious new district of Prague founded in 1348 and known still as the New Town, were governed by a well-developed sense of liturgical decorum and experience (Fig. 2). Nevertheless the centerpiece of the ceremony described in contemporary sources was a modest wooden structure, known as Heiltumstuhl in German, probably similar to other such temporary structures, including Louis IX's relic scaffolding used for the display of the Crown of Thorns and the particle of the True Cross during their translation to Paris in 1241.[18] It is unclear whether the New Town's wooden tower was a permanent fixture of the Charles Square until it was replaced by the stone chapel or if it was erected annually in the manner of the famous Heiltumstuhl in Nuremberg, where the Feast of the Holy Lance and Nails was staged after the imperial treasure and insignia were transferred to that city in 1424.

Like its predecessor, the new stone chapel was situated approximately in the middle of the square on the axis of the street that led to St John's Gate (the so-called Slepá or Svinská street) on the eastern circuit of the New Town's walls (Fig. 2).[19] It was one of many important secular and religious institutions congregated in and around the Charles Square. On the north side of the square the New Town hall with its gabled façade and imposing asymmetrically placed belfry was the visible civic focus

[15] *MVB*, vol. 5, part 1, p. 596, no. 1074; *Monumenta historica*, p. 342; Tomek, *Základy*, vol. 2, p. 26-27. A Burgundian knight, Guillebert de Lannoy, who visited Prague in April of 1414, mentions in his travelogue a tall tower in the New Town where he saw, in the king's presence, very precious relics, which were publicly displayed once a year. Charles Potvin (ed.), *Œuvres de Ghilebert de Lannoye, voyageur, diplomate et moraliste*, Louvain, 1878. Quoted after Jaroslav Svátek, ""Do té země jsem přijel, ale zase ji rychle opustil..." Návštěva burgundského cestovatele Guilleberta Lannoy v husitských Čechách", in *Medievalia Historica Bohemica*, 11, Prague, 2007, p. 195-210.

[16] The ceremonial reception and procession of the imperial insignia and relics and their first display in the new Town are described by the chronicler Francis of Prague, "Chronicon Francisci Pragensis", in *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 4, ed. Josef Emler & Josef Jireček, Prague, 1884, p. 347–456, here p. 453. The feast of the Holy Lance and Nail was officially instituted by Innocent VI's bull *In redemptoris nostri* on 13 February, 1354; for the text of the bull see Antonín Podlaha & Eduard Šittler, *Chrámový poklad u sv. Víta v Praze*, *Jeho dějiny a popis*, Prague, 1903, p. 29, note 1; Jan Bedřich Novák, *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia*, vol. 2, Prague, 1907, p. 90, nos 210 and 211.

[17] Zoë Opačić, "Architecture and Religious Experience in 14th-century Prague", in *Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument: Böhmen und das Heilige Römische Reich unter den Luxemburgern im europäischen Kontext*, ed. Jiří Fajt & Andrea Langer, Berlin & Munich, 2009, p. 136-149; the liturgy of the display is expertly discussed by Kateřina Kubínová, *Imitatio Romae. Karel IV a Řím*, Prague, 2006, p. 221-254 and 291-298.

[18] For a comparison between Prague and Paris displays see Opačić, "Architecture and Religious Experience", p. 140.

[19] The precise location of the chapel before its demolition is marked on the 1719 plan of the New Town by J. Müller, and included again in the 1816 plan of Prague published by Geodetický a kartografický podnik (Geodetic and cartographic enterprise), Prague, 1983.

Fig. 3. Drawing of the southern half of Charles Square, New Town, Prague showing its churches: Corpus Christi Chapel (far left), St Katherine's and St Apollinaris's (above left and right); St Charlemagne's or Karlov (next to the city wall, upper right); the Emmaus Monastery (bottom right edge of the drawing), and Our Lady on the Lawn (immediately above it), Philipp van den Bossche, 1606 (Ústav dějin umění, Akademie věd České republiky, Prague)

of the district, while shops, and especially the long vaulted market hall and salting house which stood between the hall and the chapel, were the pivots of its commercial life, including the important annual market days.[20] On the west side of the square was the old suburb of Zderaz and the home to the order of the Custodians of the Holy Sepulchre (*Custodes Sancti Sepulchri Hierosolymitani*),[21] where the new confraternity in charge of Corpus Christi was founded. This knightly order was directly under the authority of the patriarch of Jerusalem; significantly, their church contained a small replica of the Sepulchre, thus foreshadowing, at least symbolically, the new chapel at the heart of the square. On the south side lay one of the key New Town foundations of Charles IV, the Slavonic or Emmaus monastery, clearly distinguished on the 1606 view by its ponderous barn-like outline and enormous saddleback roof (Figs 3, 10 and 11).[22]

The square also provided a main thoroughfare linking the Old Town (and Prague Castle beyond) with the ancient Přemyslid fortress of Vyšehrad on the city's southern tip. Although this route existed before the foundation of the New Town,[23] after 1348 it became a royal *via triumphalis* for memorable processions including the coronation, Charles IV's funeral and the first entry into the city of the imperial insignia and the Passion relics after their arrival to Vyšehrad. The new chapel was thus deliberately situated not only on one of the most prominent and public locations in Prague but also on a nexus of meaningful axes, eloquently and evocatively discussed by Paul Crossley.[24] In such a bustling, exposed location the unusual shape of this, the most outstanding of churches in Wenceslas IV's Prague, would have been instantly apparent.

Unfortunately, Corpus Christi was pulled down in 1789 and has never been properly excavated. Today its appearance can only be reconstructed from the early *vedute* of Prague, but that evidence is vague and, at times, contradictory. It is certain that the chapel was a centrally shaped structure, encircled by a wall and topped by a tower. In the mid-nineteenth century, Karl Grünes reconstructed a rotunda with a series of shallow square chapels, a solution adopted by Vilém Lorenc in his 1972 study of the Now Town, despite it being curiously at odds with all currently known representations of the chapel (Fig. 4).[25] Although they differ in detail, the seventeenth-century views of Charles Square by

[20] For the topography of the New Town see Vilém Lorenc, *Nové Město pražské*, Prague, 1973, Paul CROSSLEY, "The Politics of Presentation: The Architecture of Charles IV of Bohemia," in *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Sarah Rees JONES, Richard MARKS & Alastair J. MINNIS, York, 2000, 99-172, Paul CROSSLEY & Zoë OPAČIĆ, "Prague as a New Capital", in *Prague, The Crown of Bohemia*, ed. Barbara Drake BOEHM & Jiří FAJT (exhibition catalogue Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), New Haven, 2005, p. 59-73; Zoë OPAČIĆ, "Sacred Topography of Medieval Prague", in *Sacred Sites and Holy Places: Expoloring the Sacralisation of Landscape Through Time and Space*, ed. Sæbjørg Walaker NORDEIDE & Stefan BRINK, forthcoming.

[21] František EKERT, Posvátná místa (král. hl. města) Prahy, vol. 2, Prague, 1884, p. 471-480; Anežka MERHAUTOVÁ, *Raně středověká architektura v Čechách*, Prague, 1971, p. 261; Franz MACHILEK, "Privatfrömmigkeit und Staatsfrömmigkeit", in *Kaiser Karl IV., Staatsmann und Mäzen,* ed. Ferdinand SEIBT, Nuremberg & Cologne, 1978, p. 87-101, p. 91; Viktor KOTRBA, "Nové Město pražské – 'Karstadt' v univerzální koncepci císaře Karla IV", in ed. Jan PETR, & Sáva ŠABOUK, *Z tradic slovanské kultury v Čechách: Sázava a Emauzy v dějinách české kultury*, Prague, 1975, p. 53-66, especially p. 60.

[22] This important institution is discussed in a collection of essays: Klára BENEŠOVSKÁ & Kateřina KUBÍNOVÁ (ed.), *Emauzy. Benediktinský klášter Na Slovanech v srdci Prahy*, Prague, 2008; see also Zoë OPAČIĆ, *Charles IV and the Emmaus Monastery: Slavonic Tradition and Imperial Ideology in Fourteenth-century Prague*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, 2003 (currently in preparation for publication as: *Prague and the Emmaus Monastery: Slavonic Tradition and Imperial Ideology in the Age of Charles IV*); Klára BENEŠOVSKÁ, "Benediktinský klášter Na Slovanech s kostelem Panny Marie a slovanských patronů", in *Umění*, 44, 1996, p. 118-130, where the idea of the monastery's direct involvement in the relic ceremony on the Charles Square was first postulated.

[23] Lorenc, *Nové Město*, p.28.

[24] CROSSLEY, "The Politics of Presentation", p. 128-132.

[25] Karl GRÜNES, "Die Corporis Christi-Kirche in Prag", in *Libussa Jahrbuch*, 2, 1843, p. 313-329; Lorenc, *Nové Město*, fig. 54 a,b,c.

Fig. 4. Corpus Christi Chapel, New Town, Prague, reconstruction by on the left: Karl Grünes (Karl Grünes, "Die Corporis Christi-Kirche in Prag", in *Libussa Jahrbuch*, 2, 1843); right: Vilém Lorenc (Vilém Lorenc, *Nové Město pražské*, Prague, 1973)

Philipp van den Bossche (published by Aegidius Sadeler in 1606) (Fig. 2) Caspar Bechteler,[26] and Ouden-Allen (1675) (Fig. 5) all show a cruciform building, which in Sadeler's more detailed view also has diagonally placed chapels. Following this evidence, Erich Bachmann and Václav Mencl (Fig. 6) have proposed a more credible reconstruction: an equilaterally cross-shaped structure with axial chapels, resembling an eight-point star, with polygonal endings on all sides except for the western arm (the main entrance), again a detail somewhat at odds with the known views, which do not show polygonal endings on the southern (used as a side entrance) or the eastern arm.[27]

The question of the shape of the tower – square (Sadeler) or polygonal (Ouden-Allen) (Figs 2 and 5) – is perhaps answered by the aforementioned papal bull of 1397 which states that the chapel was "like a square tower from which the relics were displayed", and was meant perhaps as a *pars pro toto* description of the edifice.[28] Internal arrangement of the chapel is even more elusive. The best witness is the historian Bohuslav Balbín, who saw the chapel before its Baroque reconstruction in 1720-1737. He admired the building's regular ashlars, the slender piers in the interior with twisted and playful acanthus (?)capitals which in the corners supported graceful arches/vaults. He also noted crypt spaces

[26] Caspar Bechteler's relief in the ambulatory of Prague Cathedral depicting the flight of Friedrich of Pfalz from Prague in 1620, gives the same view of the chapel as Aegidius Sadeler and it is likely that it was based on it or on a similar view. For a detail of this work showing the chapel see Milena Bartlová, "Původ husitského kalicha z ikonografického hlediska", in *Umění*, 44, 1996, p. 179.

[27] Erich Bachmann, "Ein verschollener gotischer Zentralbau in Prag", in *Stifter-Jahrbuch*, 3, 1953, p. 156-168. Václav Mencl, *Česká architektura doby lucemburské*, Prague, 1948, p. 123.

[28] *MVB*, vol. 5, part 1, p.596, no. 1074.

Fig. 5. Corpus Christi Chapel, New Town, Prague, detail from Folpertus van Ouden-Allen's engraving of the New Town, 1675 (Zoë Opačić)

Fig. 6. Corpus Christi Chapel, New Town, Prague, reconstruction of the ground plan and elevation after Václav Mencl (Václav Mencl, *Česká architektura doby lucemburské*, Prague, 1948)

where the Imperial insignia and Passion relics from Karlstein were kept before their annual display from the chapel tower.[29]

Although we cannot hope to reconstruct the Corpus Christi chapel in every detail, it is clear that the choice of its form represented an important symbolic statement. In contrast to the rest of Western architecture, the rotunda was a common building type in Bohemia and Moravia, a legacy of their Byzantine connections, and it counted among its number the first church built on the site of the present cathedral, founded by Bohemia's principal patron saint Wenceslas. Several early rotundas existed in the city in the fourteenth century, most notably the chapel of St Longinus east of Charles Square used for the burial of pilgrims who were interred in the earth brought to Prague from the Holy Land. From 1350 another, more ambitious rotunda – of a similar size to the Corpus Christi – was being constructed in the south-east corner of the New Town, founded by Charles IV and dedicated to St Charlemagne (known as Karlov) (Fig. 3). In this instance the choice of the building type was far from

[29] *Sacellum Corporis Christi in Boario Novae Civitatis foro contraria prorsus dote celebratur: columnis gratiosissimis intuss suffultum, fornicum angulis summa venustate, et varietate, acanthi more, sese curvantibus, et quasi ludentibus, ut taceam subterraneas cellas, in quibus olim Sanctorum Reliquias Carlsteinenses asservare solebant Veters iis diebus e Turre sacelli quotannis Populo monstrari solebant. Tota hec ecclesia caeso, et quadrato lapide constat*. Bohuslav Balbín, *Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae L.III*, 1681, p. 134; An earlier source, Tomáš Pěšina states that the Imperial treasure was kept in the underground treasury of the Corpus Christi chapel between 1379 and 1410, where it was sometimes shown to foreign visitors. Although this is not first-hand evidence it should not be entirely dismissed. Even if the relics were kept in Karlstein at this time on a permanent basis they may have been temporarily stored in the New Town around the Holy Lance feast. Tomáš Pešina z Čechorodu, *Gloria Metropolitanae ecclesiae*, Prague, 1664, vol. 4, fol. 408; Pešina clearly knew Corpus Christi well and describes the stone gallery from where the relics were displayed. Following Pešina Johannes F. Hammerschmied, *Prodromus Gloriae Pragenae*, Prague, 1723, p. 332-334, also mentions crypt spaces, and furthermore describes the chapel as being *ad modum stellae*, which corresponds to Sadeler's view. For the history of the chapel based on early sources see Julius Max Schottky, *Prag wie es war und wie es ist*, vol. 1, Prague, 1831, p.418-423; Grünes, "Die Corporis Christi-Kirche"; and František Ekert, *Posvátná místa Prahy*, vol. 1, part 2, Prague, 1884, p. 480-487.

Fig. 7. Trinkhorn, circa 1400, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Grünes Gewölbe, IV 333 (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden)

accidental: the evocation of Charlemagne's chapel in Aachen underlined the idea of *translatio imperii* to a new, eastern capital under a new Charles.[30]

In his 1953 study of the Corpus Christi chapel, Erich Bachmann considered a range of examples from Byzantine and Western architecture in search for models for the Prague chapel, finding the closest parallel in the mid-thirteenth century Liebfrauenkirche in Trier (?1227-1273), an impressive complexly centralized building whose ground plan is shaped by a continuous undulating rhythm of polygonal chapels broken only by an extended protrusion of the eastern arm.[31] But the differences between these two buildings are as striking as the similarities. The Corpus Christi's axial chapels were probably of an equal height, unlike those at Trier, creating a greater sense of spatial integration. We can also safely assume that the Liebfrauenkirche's majestic forms, deriving from the sophisticated world of French High Gothic and Rayonnant architecture, were not replicated in the New Town's austere and

[30] For Charles IV's creative fascination with Charlemagne (and for a further bibliography relating to Karlov) see Zoë Opačić, "*Karolus Magnus* and *Karolus Quartus*: Imperial Role Models in Ingelheim, Aachen and Prague", in *Mainz and the Middle Rhine Valley: Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology*, ed. Ute Engel & Alexandra Gajewski (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 30), Leeds, 2007, p. 221-246.

[31] Bachmann, "Ein verschollener gotischer Zentralbau", p. 161-168.

Fig. 8. Wenceslas Bible, circa 1390, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2759; Left: Temple of Solomon (vol. 2, fol. 117v); Right: Jews completing the building of the Temple (vol. 3, fol. 86r) (Ústav dějin umění, Akademie věd České republiky, Prague)

simplified Reduktionsgotik milieu.[32] But much of the New Town architecture was driven by strong evocative choices, as we have seen in the case of St Charlemagne's church. The tabernacle-like staggered shapes of the Corpus Christi bring to mind the elaborate micro-architectural forms of contemporary monstrances, sacrament houses and reliquaries, all suitable models for a chapel dedicated to the display of relics. Comparisons can also be made between the chapel on Sadeler's view and the microarchitecture on the tip of the splendid horn (Trinkhorn) from Dresden, made in Prague in or around 1400 as a magnificent gift, likely to have been commissioned by the king himself or someone in his circle (Fig. 7).[33]

Nonetheless, the unique symbolism of the Passion relics in particular suggests that the most powerful spiritual inspiration, if not a direct architectural source for the Corpus Christi is to be found in Jerusalem. Although the most immediate parallels can be drawn with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (the Anastasis Rotunda) and its obvious correspondence in form and meaning, the Old Testament analogy may have even greater significance. The centralized form of the Corpus Christi, its position and association with the Arma Christi, bear a telling resemblance to the widely-circulated

[32] For the most recent discussion of the Liebfrauenkirche in Trier and a further bibliography see Marc Carel SCHURR, *Gotische Architektur im mittleren Europa 1220-1340*, Berlin, 2007, p. 23-29, and the article by Marc Carel SCHURR in this volume.

[33] Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Grünes Gewölbe, IV 333. Evelin WETTER, "Trinkhorn", in *Sigismundus rex et imperator: Kunst und Kultur zur Zeit Sigismunds von Luxemburg 1387-1437*, ed. Imre TAKÁCS (exhibition catalogue Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest & Musée national d'histoire et d'art, Luxembourg), Mainz, 2006, p. 371-372, no. 4.84.

medieval diagrams of Jerusalem which represented the city as an encircled grid of streets sheltering the isolated structure of the *Templum Domini* (the Temple of Solomon, later replaced by the Dome of the Rock) in the middle - which among its many holies also contained Aaron's rod, the relic sometimes associated with the Holy Lance.[34] It is not coincidental that in the famous Wenceslas Bible illuminated in the royal scriptorium in this period, the Temple of Solomon often features as a centrally-planned structure with a square tower, surrounded by lower chapels (Fig. 8).[35] However, for deeply-spiritual Wenceslas, as for his cosmopolitan father, even more influential must have been the vision of an ideal Christian city, not an earthly but a Heavenly Jerusalem, "the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High".[36]

It is almost beyond doubt that Wenceslas IV was from the outset behind both the construction of the Corpus Christi Chapel and the foundation of the Confraternity whose raison d'être was the completion of that task. This was not, however, his personal foundation in the manner of Charles IV's New Town churches, which Charles at least initially endowed. In the first phase, before and around 1382, Wenceslas and Archbishop Jenstein worked in accord, but as their conflict intensified the archbishop kept his distance or protested, as on the occasion when, in 1391, Wenceslas IV petitioned the pope for indulgences for the Jubilee Year of 1393. The fact that most members of the Confraternity belonged to the royal circle is not accidental. It is certain that the reason for the establishment of the new confraternity was not solely the construction of a new chapel – where, among other, masses would have been said for the deceased members – but that there was also a deeper motif which linked the chapel with the cult of the Eucharist, the veneration of Christ's body, and the holiest of relics there displayed. This eucharistic focus was part of the growing interest in the reform and regeneration of the Church, a specifically Bohemian form of Devotio moderna which included an emphasis on more frequent communion.[37]

The key to the role of the Confraternity seems to lie in the somewhat mysterious name of this unique society of "Wenceslas's faithful" as it appears in the foundation charter: "*principales capitanei fratream seu societatem gerentes seu facientes cum signo circuli et malleo in medio pendente, quod vulgariter obrucz dicitur*" (we, the foremen who lead and govern the confraternity or society in the sign of the circle with a pendant hammer, commonly known as obruč). Today this symbol is a puzzling rebus that has been differently interpreted.[38] Precise translation of the Latin terms may be essential in resolving the mystery. The word *malleus* is undoubtedly "hammer", but *circulus* has several possible interpretations, although the charter is specific in identifying the only correct one in Czech - obruč (circle).[39] If we consult dictionaries of medieval Czech, *circulus is translated as kruh, kroužek, kotouč,*

[34] Carol Herselle Krinsky, "Representations of the Temple of Jerusalem before 1500", in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 33, 1970, p. 1-19.

[35] *Wenceslas Bible*, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 2759, vol. 2, fol. 117v and vol. 3, fol. 86r.

[36] Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*, ed. and transl. Robert W. Dyson, Book 9, Chapter 1, Cambridge, 1998, p. 449.

[37] Zdeňka Hledíková, ""O Devotio moderna" trochu jinak", in *Querite primum regnum Dei: Sborník příspěvků k poctě Jany Nechutové*, ed. Helena Krmíčková, Anna Pumprová, Dana Růžičková & Libor Švanda, Brno 2006, p. 403-416.

[38] Bartlová, "Původ husitského kalicha"; Milena Bartlová, "The Magic of Image: Astrological, Alchemical and Magical Symbolism at the Court of Wenceslas IV", in *The Role of Magic in the Past. Learned and Popular Magic, Popular beliefs and Diversity of Atitudes,* ed. Blanka Szeghyova, Budapest, 2007, p. 19-28.

[39] Thanks to Zuzana Silagiová from Kabinet pro klasická studia, Filosofický ústav Akademie věd České republiky (Department of Classical Studies at the Philosophical Intitute, Czech Academy of Sciences) and the editor of the Dictionary of Medieval Latin, for her helpful advice on the possible translations. The following semantic discussion of the name of the Confraternity of the Circle with the Pendant Hammer in relation to the Corpus Christi chapel and Wenceslas IV's court order are based on Klára Benešovská's lengthy research of this topic which is being prepared for publication in Czech.

Fig. 9. Theological compendium for Bishop Jan Železný, between 1388 and 1392, Stams, Stiftsbibliothek, cod. 12, fol. 1r (Stiftsbibliothek Stams, photo Maria Theisen)

obruč (circle, small circle, disc, ring).[40] But how are we to imagine the hammer hanging within a circle or a ring, without knowing how and where it was suspended – at the top, in the middle or below? Apart from being a blacksmith's tool, the hammer (*malleus*) also has a number of allegorical meanings, linked precisely with its destructive powers; thus, for example, St Augustine was described as *validissimus maleus hereticorum*, and the communion in one kind only as the "the righteous hammer against sin".[41] We can surmise that in this context the hammer was seen as an instrument against sin and injustice and that its incorporation into the emblem signaled the Confraternity's aim of supporting the forces of reform.[42]

However, *circulus* could be interpreted in several ways: as a circle and a ring, a wooden or metal belt used for turning or hoisting, and also a type of necklace known in Old Czech as "halže", *torques* in Latin, torque in English.[43] This last interpretation is significant because it is also a synonym of "točenice", a twisted kerchief tied in a knot at the bottom with dangling or fluttering ends. Since the 1380s "točenice" emerged among a variety of insignia as one of the principal emblems of Wenceslas IV's new courtly order.[44] In the same form it appears in contemporary Bohemian art as one of the Instruments of Christ's Passion, the veil (*velum*) used to cover His eyes during the flagellation in Caiaphas's house. This relic was part of the collection of the Passion relics displayed during the feast of Corpus Christi in the Franciscan monastery in Český Krumlov, the seat of the powerful Rožmberk family in southern Bohemia, in an annual ceremony held in the years between 1391 and 1417.[45] The representation of the "točenice" in its recognizable heraldic form can be seen among the Instruments of the Passion on the wall painting in the church of Sts Peter and Paul in Morašice near Litomyšl, and in the margin of the titular page of the contemporary manuscript (Stams, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod.12) commissioned after 1388 by the bishop of Litomyšl, Jan Železný, who was also responsible for the decoration of the church in Morašice and its consecration (Fig. 9).[46] In the initial we see the bishop kneeling before the Man of Sorrows who is depicted standing in the open tomb. In the lower right-

[40] For "obruč" see *Staročeský slovník*, Prague, 1968, p. 170-171, and for "circulus", *Latinitatis Medii Aevi Lexicon Bohemorum. Slovník středověké latiny v českých zemích*, vol. 5, Prague 1983, p. 670-671.

[41] Hilarius Litoměřický, *Traktát o nejsvětějším přijímání lidu obecného pod jednou způsobou*, ed. Antonín Podlaha, Prague, 1905. The quote is taken from the lexical catalogue of Oddělení vývoje jazyka, Ústav pro jazyk český Akademie věd České republiky (Department for the development of language, Institute for the Czech Language, Czech Academy of Sciences).

[42] Bartlová, "The Magic of Image", p. 25 offers an interpretation in the sense of a hammer of Thor. We should mention, at least in passing, the association between the hammer and the nails - one of the symbols of Christ's Passion which were displayed from the chapel – in Kolda of Koldic's treatise *De strenuo milite*: *... clavis et malleis conpegit, illud factum, scilicet nostre redempcionis, malleorum concussionibus solidavit* ("nails and hammers fastened that feat, [that is] our redemption was strengthened by the strokes of hammers"); *Frater Colda ordinis praedicatorum, Tractatus mystici*, ed. and transl. Dana Martínková, Prague, 1997, p. 22-23. Here the role of the hammer in the economy of personal salvation is explicitly stated.

[43] *torques, quis est ornamentum colli, obrucz*, the entry for "Obruč", in *Staročeský slovník*, Prague, 1968, p. 170.

[44] On the courtly orders of the Luxembourgs see most recently Milada Studničková, "Drehknoten und Drachen. Die Orden Wenzels IV. und Sigismunds von Luxemburg und die Bedeutung der Abzeichen", in *Kunst als Herrschaftsinstrument*, p. 377-387.

[45] Klára Benešovská, "Drobná poznámka k původnímu významu točenice", in *Žena ve člunu. Sborník k poctě Haně J. Hlaváčkové*, ed. Kateřina Horníčková & Michal Šroněk, Prague, 2007, p. 371-382, cites (on p. 381) the testimony of Martin Kabátník, a Czech pilgrim to Jerusalem in 1492-1494, who describes the symbol on Caiaphas's house as a golden torque; *Martina Kabátníka Cesta z Čech do Jerusalema a Kaira r. 1491 – 1492*, ed. Justin V. Prášek, Prague, 1894, p. 16. For the description of the Český Krumlov relic display see Ferdinand Tadra, "Ukazování sv. Ostatků v Českém Krumlově", in *Časopis Musea Království českého*, 54, 1880, p. 432-437.

[46] The bishop's personal involvement with the church is testified by the letter of indulgences offered to those who supported the new work (also requested by the successive bishops), and by the fact that he consecrated the church. Karel Stejskal, "Nástěnné malby v Morašicích", *Umění*, 8, 1960, p. 135-160. On the Stams manuscript see Josef Krása, *Rukopisy Václava IV.*, Prague, 1971, p. 47, fig. 29.

hand margin next to his family coat of arms (party per pale argent and sable, with fess azure)[47] set in a quatrefoil is the torque wound around the eagle – the sign of the membership of Wenceslas's courtly order, and the evidence of the bishop's place in Wenceslas IV's innermost circle: as well as belonging to the king's courtly order, in the early 1380s Jan Železný was also a member of the royal council and was mistakenly thought to have been a founding member of the Confraternity of the Circle with the Pendant Hammer.[48] The emergence of Wenceslas's personal courtly order belongs to the same period as the foundation of the Confraternity. Like the Confraternity, it gathered around the king the people loyal to him, both from the upper and the lower echelons of nobility, as well as members of patrician families and ecclesiastical dignitaries.[49] Its membership varied, and it is likely that his two queens (Joanna and Sophia) also belonged to it.[50] The membership of the order was conferred by the bestowing of the torque and it signified the confirmation of political allegiance, especially in relations with foreign courts.[51] After Wenceslas's death the order was adopted by his heirs to the Bohemian throne.[52]

The foundation charter of Wenceslas's order has not been preserved, only its rich and varied constellation of emblems which was used – above all in his manuscripts – in different combinations, indicating that this was not a typical chivalric order, as commonly found in other European courts. Its deeper meaning can be reconstructed through a closer investigation of the heraldic symbols and mottos linked with the figures of the king and queen and other protagonists, in apparently playful allegorical "performances", found, for example, in the margins of Wenceslas's Bible. Their interpretation is only possible in the context of the Old Testament texts that they accompany. Although the choice

[47] The coat of arms of the Prague patrician family of Benešovský (Beneschower) is identical to that of Bishop Jan Železný and it appears among the heraldic symbols in relief on the Old Town Hall in Prague, see further Rostislav Nový, "Nejstarší heraldické památky staroměstské radnice v Praze", *Pražský sborník historický*, 22, Prague, 1989, p.33-64.

[48] Stejskal, "Nástěnné malby", p. 144. Krása, *Rukopisy Václava IV*., p. 49, fig. 29, and especially Studničková , "Drehknoten", p. 379. Krása (p. 55) mistakenly interprets the family emblem as that of the Confraternity of the Circle with a Pendant Hammer to which he thought the bishop belonged (though he does not make that same connection with the torque in the lower margin). It has not been possible to identify the bishop's name among the members. Václav Vladivoj Tomek (*Dějepis města Prahy*, vol. 2, Prague, 1871, p. 457, note 18) linked one of the signatories of the Confraternity's foundation charter, Jessco Busschower, with the patrician Jan Benešovský (also known as Hána/Hans/Jan Beneschower), who was the father of Jan Železný, but not a Confraternity member. Jessco Busschower's seal appended to the charter is different from that of Jan Benešovský found on Prague's Old Town Hall (see above note 47) and bears a legend S IOHANNIS DE BUSSOWICZ. This was pointed out by Zdeňka Hledíková, who however follows Tomek's identification between Jan Benešovský and Jessco Buschower in the main body of her article, while observing in note 28 that the coats of arms of the two men are entirely different. Zdeňka Hledíková, "Litomyšlský biskup Jan IV. Železný a jeho vizitace", in *Studie o rukopisech*, 21, 1982, p. 115–139, esp. p. 117, note 28. Jan became the bishop of Litomyšl in 1388 and acquired the sobriquet Železný (Iron) because of his hardline stance against the Hussites after 1410. Jan Železný's relatively modest background may have been the source of invectives from the Bohemian noblemen at the Council of Constance, who took the side of Jan Hus. The bishop was initially in Wenceslas IV's inner circle as a member of his order, but changed sides after 1393 and supported Archbishop Jan of Jenstein; see also the article in the second volume of this series: Maria Theisen, "Picturing Frana", in *Studies in Medieval Art, Liber Amicorum Paul Crossley: Image, Memory and Devotion*, ed. Zoë Opačić & Achim Timmermann, Turnhout, 2011. Václav Novotný, "Jan Železný, biskup litomyšlský a olomoucký", in *Ottův slovník naučný*, 12, Prague, 1897, p. 1059-1062. František M. Bartoš, "Příspěvky k dějinám Václava IV." in *Věstník České akademie věd a umění*, 51, 1942, p. 67-104, here p. 72-75.

[49] Studničková, "Drehknoten", p. 377-387; Bartoš, "Příspěvky k dějinám Václava IV.", p. 84, was the first to link directly the foundations of the Confraternity and of Wenceslas's order.

[50] The inventory of Sophia's possessions also records a chalice with a torque. Jakub Vítovský, "Lampa z pozostalosti kráĺovnej Zofie Bavorskej v Mestskom muzeu v Bratislave", in *Ars*, 1, 1991, p. 45-58. Studničková, "Drehknoten", p. 379.

[51] Pál Lővei, "Hoforden im Mittelalter, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Drachenorders", in *Sigismundus, rex et imperator*, p. 251-263, esp. 254.

[52] Studničková, "Drehknoten", p. 384.

of the figures and their typological meaning was linked to texts on astrology and alchemy, and to the tradition of courtly love, the ultimate meaning was centred on the attainment of moral perfection, and on the salvation and spiritual regeneration of the king and of the kingdom entrusted to him.[53]

Those same ideas should be looked for behind the advent of the *Fraternitas cum signo circuli et malleo in medio pendente*, of which the king and his (then) closest circle were the members. The resemblance between the torque, the emblem of his personal order, and that of the Confraternity of the Corpus Christi is very close, as is the time of the formation of the two orders.[54] This idea is supported by the appearance of the hammer and the torque on the communal chalice described in the St Vitus's treasury inventory of 1441 and 1465: *calix argenteus ..in quo torques, id est toczyenice, cum malleis...*, and *calix..habens duas torques in pede et duos anulos cum malleis* ("silver chalice…in [which] is a torque, that is točenice, with hammers…"; "chalice has two torques on its foot and two rings with hammers").[55] It is logical that at the moment when the chapel was handed over to the university – the centre of the reformation, initially supported by the king and the highest ecclesiastical circles – a large chalice was fastened on the tower and painted above the gate. On Wenceslas IV's orders, the chapel offered communion in both kinds (*sub utraque specie*) from 1416.[56]

Wenceslas's close affinity to the chapel is demonstrated by his efforts to elevate it among the most important churches in Prague (as seen from his petitions to the pope discussed above), and also by the fact that he located his New Town residence (now lost) in close proximity to it. The palace was erected near the church of St Wenceslas in Zderaz, on a stunning promontory over the river, with a garden and a passage that led to the well and the baths at St Wenceslas's (Figs 10 and 11).[57] The residence is referred to as *curia regis* only from 1406, having been hitherto described as *curia ducis* as it belonged to his brother Jan of Görlitz (died 1396). Wenceslas may have had it originally built for his brother, or for himself while allowing Jan to use it as his Prague residence. Wenceslas's stay here is documented in 1399. It is characteristic of Wenceslas's Prague residences (the south wing at Prague Castle and the Royal Palace in the Old Town) that they occupy sites close to the town walls and gates, in the case of need for a sudden escape, and that their dominant feature is a tower, often straddling the fortifications. These choices were not governed only by considerations of security but also by the commanding view over the river and the city. The tall residential tower is a striking feature of older patrician residences, including the Old Town house of his grandfather, John of Luxembourg, known as the House at the Stone Bell,[58] and also of the Přemyslid Prague Castle, which had a residential tower on the south side, accessed from the royal palace, much liked by the king's great grandfather Wenceslas II (1278-1305).[59] It also brings to mind the custom of using towers as private retreats such as *studiola*. Examples can be found not only in contemporary Parisian royal residences of Charles V and his sons, and in the towers

[53] Hana J. Hlaváčková, "Courtly Body in the Bible of Wenceslas IV.", in *Künstlerischer Austausch: Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Berlin, 15.-20. Juli 1992*, ed. Thomas W. Gaetghens, vol. 2, Berlin, 1993, p. 371-382.

[54] Although the precise date of the foundation of Wenceslas's courtly order is not known, the earliest representation of the torque as its symbol can be found between 1381 and 1384 simultaneously in manuscripts, architecture (the Old Town Bridge Tower) and on the golden ducat struck in Kutná Hora in 1383-1384.

[55] Podlaha & Šittler, *Chrámový poklad,* p. 65 and 70. This evidence may suggest that the donor may have been a member of either the Confraternity of the Circle with the Pendant or of Wenceslas's order, since the two shared many aspects in the 1380s.

[56] Ekert, *Posvátná místa*, vol. 1, part 2, Praha 1884, p. 484.

[57] Lorenc, *Nové město*, p. 148-150. Tomek, *Základy*, vol. 2, p. 125-127.

[58] Klára Benešovská, "The House at the Stone Bell: Royal Representation in Early-Fourteenth-Century Prague", in *Prague and Bohemia*, p. 48-63.

[59] Pointed out by Jan Libor, "Deset "purkrabích" na dvoře Přemysla Otakara II.", in *Skladba a kultura,* p. 81-89. Sincere thanks to Petr Chotěbor from Obor památkové péče, Pražský hrad (Department for the Preservation of Monuments, Prague Castle) for enabling Klára Benešovská's study of the tower's remains in situ.

Fig. 10. New Town, detail of the view of Prague from Hartmann Schedel's *Liber cronicarum*, Nuremberg, 1493; Wenceslas IV's residence in Zderaz and the church of St Wenceslas (below the tree middle left); the Emmaus Monastery (right) (Klára Benešovská)

of the papal palace in Avignon,[60] but also the so-called Torre Aquila in Trent's Castelvecchio (now Castello del Buonconsiglio) the seat of Wenceslas's courtier and later bishop of Trent, George of Lichtenstein. Wencleslas's choice of Prague residences confirm his desire to remove himself further away from the archbishop and his circle in the Castle and Malá Strana – first to the Old Town and then finally in direction of Vyšehrad, where the dean and later provost of the chapter of Sts Peter and Paul was Wenceslas Králík of Buřenice, his advisor and possibly a distant relative. Wenceslas Králík was also a member of the Confraternity and an excellent diplomat, who eventually obtained the title of patriarch of Antioch (in 1397) and the bishop of Olomouc (1413-1416).

During the conflict with the archbishop, Wenceslas attempted to create in Vyšehrad an alternative power base to the cathedral chapter, following a similar precedent during the reign of King Vratislav in the eleventh century. Wenceslas's loyal followers sought titular offices at the Vyšehrad chapter and the estates tied to its burgravate.[61] Thanks to Pope Boniface's favourable attitude Vyšehrad was given a number of privileges, its church expensively rebuilt and equipped with new chapels, altars, liturgical vessels and paintings, the latter featuring the torque emblem (on the south wall of the first - easternmost - chapel on the south side).[62] In 1409 Wenceslas Králík obtained indulgences befitting a pilgrimage church and acquired relics of St Longinus.[63] As we have seen, the Jubilee Year of 1393 began at Vyšehrad and not at the cathedral, with the Corpus Christi chapel as the next stop on the pilgrims' prescribed route. After Wenceslas's death on 18 August 1419, Queen Sophia had the king's embalmed body presented in state in Vyšehrad rather than in the cathedral. It could be said, without much exaggeration, that almost half a century after Charles IV founded the New Town, his son Wenceslas elevated it - together with Vyšehrad - to the status of his personal royal district.

[60] On the relationship between French and Bohemian towered residences see Klára Benešovská, "Architektura ve službách panovníka – Základní architektonická koncepce Karlštejna a její inspirační zdroje", in *Schodištní cykly velké věže hradu Karlštejna*, ed. Zuzana Všetečková (Průzkumy památek, 13), Prague, 2006, p. 96-105. For Avignon see Sylvain Gagnière, *Le Palais des Papes d'Avignon*, Avignon, 1994; *Monument de l'histoire. Construire, reconstruire le Palais des Papes XIVe-XXe siècle. Catalogue de l'exposition, Palais de Papes: Avignon 29 juin-29 septembre 2002*, Avignon, 2002.

[61] Polívka, "K šíření husitství", p. 101.

[62] Zuzana Všetečková, "Gotické nástěnné malby v kostele sv. Petra a Pavla na Vyšehradě", in *Královský Vyšehrad II,* Kostelní Vydří, 2001, p. 133-153, here p. 135-140 and fig. 24.

[63] Helena Soukupová "K problematice Vyšehradu", in *Průzkumy památek*, 12/2, 2005, p. 3-52.

Fig. 11 Vilém Lorenc's reconstruction of Wenceslas IV's residence in Zderaz after Schedel's chronicle (see Fig. 10) and Baroque plans; Wenceslas IV's residence (top left); the Emmaus monastery (centre), Corpus Christi Chapel (detail, far right) (Klára Benešovská after Vilém Lorenc, *Nové Město pražské*, Prague, 1973)

In conclusion, the Corpus Christi chapel, one of the most distinguished and unusual ecclesiastical buildings in Prague, constructed from 1382 in the New Town Square, came into existence with the full knowledge and will of Wenceslas IV. The Confraternity of the Circle with the Pendant Hammer, founded at the same time, consisted of Wenceslas's close associates and councillors. Its main task, declared in the foundation charter, was the erection of the chapel to be used for the display of the Passion relics in the manner of the wooden tower that it replaced. However, the Confraternity's existence owed much to a pietistic court culture distinguished by a heightened devotion to the Eucharist and by its efforts to carry out a reform of the Church. This more secretive purpose was encoded in the Confraternity's emblem - the circle or ring - which was closely related to the torque, the symbol of Wenceslas's personal courtly order. The Confraternity and the new order were created more or less simultaneously and shared members. Not long after, Wenceslas moved from the Castle and the Old Town to the cosmopolitan New Town, close to "his" chapel and to a revived royal power-base in Vyšehrad. At the close of the fourteenth century, the Prague of Charles IV, the seat of the Holy Roman Empire with its political and spiritual centre in Prague Castle, acquired a new centre of gravity: the thriving district of the New Town, placed under the protective shield of Wenceslas's new orders, while nevertheless drawing inexorably, with the rest of the kingdom, towards a profound social and religious upheaval.

The Fourteenth-century Gothic Churches in Krakow: The Question of Iconography

Tomasz Węcławowicz

In the mid-fourteenth century, Central Europe experienced political and economic changes which transformed the artistic landscape of Bohemia, Austria, Hungary, and Poland. One of the factors important in this process was the advance of new dynasties - the Habsburgs took over the throne of Austria, Charles Robert of Anjou made his capital in Hungarian Buda, and in 1355 Emperor Charles IV established the court of the Luxemburg dynasty in Prague.

In Poland the ancient and revered Piast dynasty returned to power with the coronation of King Władysław II Łokietek in 1320 (died 1333). Thanks to dynastic marriages – two Piast princesses were married to Charles IV and Charles Robert respectively – Poland became receptive to new artistic trends. The new capital, the city of Krakow, prospered economically and became the artistic centre of the restored kingdom. Kings, bishops, and patricians began the rebuilding of old Romanesque churches in the city itself and in the two new satellite towns outside the capital's defensive walls - Kazimierz and Kleparz – which King Kazimir III the Great (1333-1370) established in the 1335-1340 and in 1366 along the main trade route. This architectural regeneration was initiated by Bishop Nanker, who embarked on the Gothic rebuilding of the cathedral on Wawel Hill in 1320, and soon, just after 1340 four great basilicas, followed suit. All these churches shared similar characteristics of plan, construction method and architectural detail pioneered by the cathedral workshop and have thus been treated in literature as one group, the so-called "Krakow school of fourteenth-century architecture". In the same period the second group of Krakow Gothic churches emerged as the old Romanesque parish churches around town were being rebuilt, again following a strikingly uniform model. In this paper I will attempt to analyze the distinguishing features of the churches belonging to these two groups and argue that iconographic analysis of their architecture helps explain their unique character and appearance.

The new cathedral church on Wawel Hill, which replaced an older structure, was begun in 1320 and dedicated some forty years later, in 1364. Before its rebuilding was begun the architectural landscape of Romanesque Krakow had been dominated by modest mendicant churches and the new cathedral emerged as a novel type of structure: a three-aisled basilica with a transept and square crossing, whose choir was designed following the Cistercian Citeaux III type plan, as a straight-ended chancel of four bays with a rectangular ambulatory (in time new chapels were added to it). The disproportionately short aisled nave of three bays terminated in the western façade, which incorporated two surviving Romanesque towers.

Not only its plan, but also the structural novelty of the Central European pillar-buttress system and sophisticated Upper Rhenish Rayonnant detail, which has its origins in the Strasbourg workshop, made the new cathedral a structure without precedent in Lesser Poland.

The pillar-buttress system was transferred to Krakow probably from the Cistercian church in Sedlec (in Bohemia, now the Czech Republic) via the early fourteenth-century aborted "chevet" that Bishop Jan Muskata planned for the first rebuilding of Krakow Cathedral. It consists of square internal buttresses attached to the outer side of arcade pillars and linked by additional arches placed behind the profiled arcade arches.

The choir elevation made of brick with stone dressing, is divided by a prominent sloping stringcourse into a low moulded arcades and a tall clerestory. The latter consists in each bay of a triple lancet window which rises the full height from the projecting cornice to the vaults and is flanked by two lower and entirely "blind" double lancet windows. The lancets of the "main" windows are also blocked at half height with blind tracery. This "Burgundian" two-storey elevation may have arrived to

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100139

Fig. 1. Krakow Cathedral, longitudinal section (Tomasz Węcławowicz 2005)

Krakow indirectly via the Cistercian church in Salem (in Swabia), or via St Florentinus at Niederhaslach (in Alsace), where an elevation of a similar type can be found. At Niederhaslach, as in Krakow, the mouldings flow uninterrupted and devoid of capitals, forming weightless arcades and thin clusters of continuous vault shafts. The two-storey elevation of the chancel is repeated in the transept arms and in the nave (Fig. 1). [1]

Around the middle of the fourteenth century, while *fabrica ecclesiae cathedralis* was still at work, King Kazimir the Great founded two churches in his new town of Kazimierz: the Austin Friars' church of St Catherine and the parish church of Corpus Christi. At the same time, in the centre of Krakow, the rebuilding of the parish church of St Mary and the Dominican church of the Holy Trinity was also ongoing. What these four churches had in common from the outset was the scale of their choirs – they were over 30 meters long and almost 30 meters high. In addition, their designs displayed a strikingly close affinity with the new Krakow Cathedral but aimed for a more austere monumentality. Originally planned hall naves were soon replaced by basilical structures, which followed the nave of the cathedral in plan, elevation scheme and detail, but exceeded it in height by approximately ten meters. The effect of monumentality in their interiors was achieved not only through magnification of dimensions and simplification of details - the arcade is so tall that the dividing cornice runs more

[1] See Paul Crossley, *Gothic Architecture in the Reign of Kazimir the Great. Church Architecture in Lesser Poland 1320-1380*, Krakow, 1985, p. 18-94; Tomasz Węcławowicz, *Krakowski kościół katedralny w wiekach średnich. Funkcje i możliwości interpretacji*, Krakow, 2005, p. 47-63 and p. 75-79.

a)

b)

Fig. 2 Krakow, great basilical churches: a. parish church of St Mary. b. Dominican church of the Holy Trinity (after *Architektura gotycka w Polsce,* ed. Teresa Mroczko & Marian Arszynski, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1995)

a)

b)

Fig. 3. Kazimierz near Krakow, great basilical churches: a. parish church of Corpus Christi. b. Austin Friars church of St Catherine (after *Architektura gotycka w Polsce,* ed. Teresa Mroczko & Marian Arszynski, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1995)

or less across the middle of the elevation. Crucial here was the effect of slight recession of wall surface in the upper storey above the cornice and between the shaft clusters. This created an impression that the rhythm of the lower arcade was repeated by the similar large blind arches. The architects working on these churches translated the Rayonnant language of the cathedral's two-storey elevation into the vocabulary of Reduktionsgotik, favouring massive forms and avoiding the fragmentation of profiled mouldings and shafts. They also followed the cathedral by employing the pillar-buttress system (Figs 2 and 3).[2]

Polish art historians first noted the unique character of Krakow's Gothic basilicas over a hundred years ago. Observing that the two-storey elevation and the pillar-buttress system were never before used in a single structure and that this type of basilica with a long and tall choir found no reception outside Krakow, they fashioned the term "Krakow school of fourteenth century architecture". In the 1970s Paul Crossley contributed to the development of this concept emphasizing the leading role of the royal master masons from the cathedral workshop, and the importance of the Rhineland and Austria for the evolution of the Krakow school. He also stressed the conservative character of Krakow and Kazimierz workshops and their unusual resistance to new stylistic fashions, the tendency which persisted in the Polish capital for over a hundred years.[3] Nevertheless, the question still remains why the masons in Krakow were so attached to outdated formulas and so reluctant to follow new trends.

Iconographical analysis of architecture, which has been applied in art history since the middle of the last century can provide us with an answer.[4] The notion of meaning (Bedeutung, in German) understood as the intention on the part of the founder, is especially useful in this consideration. The four nearly identical Krakow basilicas, following one scheme and constructed over a short time, seem to have been conceived as part of an artistic programme for the rebuilding of the Polish capital town. Their naves were modelled on the nave of the cathedral and it is likely that it was their patrons' intention to convey some of the ideas of the cathedral church, which was quickly becoming one the most important edifices in the kingdom, the true "Königskirche" - the coronation church, the royal mausoleum and the shrine of the national patron saint. The surviving fragments of original decoration of Krakow's Gothic basilicas testify that the idea of Christian kingship was an important constituent of their iconographic programme and that the awareness of this connection survived for another century in the minds of the new Jagellonian dynasty. For instance the coat of arms with the Polish eagle is still visible on the top of the eastern buttress in the church of St Mary, the king's name KA-ZY-MI-RUS has been spelled out on four rib bosses in the chapter house of the Austin Friars' monastery of St Catherine, and Queen Elizabeth of Habsburg (1436-1505) and her son cardinal Frederick Jagellonczyk (1468-1503) placed their coats of arms of the on the west front of the Corpus Christi church.

At the same time, around the middle of the fourteenth century, reconstruction began of nearly a dozen small Romanesque churches in Krakow, half the number of all the churches existing in the city at the time. Excavations revealed the remains of three churches on Wawel Hill (collegiate churches of St Michael, of St George, and the castle church of St Mary of Egypt), and in the Old Town three

[2] Tomasz Węcławowicz, *Gotyckie bazyliki Krakowa*, Krakow, 1993, p. 33-44;, *Architektura gotycka w Polsce,* ed. Teresa Mroczko & Marian Arszynski, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1995, p. 69-71.

[3] Paul Crossley, *Architecture of Kazimir the Great*, doctoral thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, 1973; Crossley, *Gothic Architecture in the Reign of Kazimir the Great,* p. 57-94.

[4] For a brief overview of literature see Paul Crossley, "In Search of an Iconography of Medieval Architecture", in *Symbolae historiae atrium. Studia z historii sztuki Lechowi Kalinowskiemu dedykowane,* ed. Jerzy Gadomski et al., Warsaw 1986, p. 55-66; Paul Crossley, "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: the Limits of Iconography", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 130, 1988, p. 116-121, here p. 116-117.

0 10 m

a)

0 10 m

b)

0 10 m

c)

Fig. 4 Krakow, double axial pillar churches: a. parish church of St Steven. b. All Saints. c. the monastic church of St Marcus (after Magdalena Goras, *Zaginione gotyckie kościoły Krakowa*, Krakow, 2003)

a) b)

c) d)

0 10 m

e)

Fig. 5 Krakow, single axial pillar churches: a. collegiate church of St Michael. b. collegiate church of St George. c. castle church of St Mary of Egypt. d. votive church of St Giles. e. parish church of the Holy Cross (after Magdalena Goras, *Zaginione gotyckie kościoły Krakowa*, Krakow, 2003)

parish churches (the Holy Cross, All Saints', and St Steven's), as well as a monastery church of St Marcus, a votive church of St Giles and the former parish church of St James in Kazimierz. We know of a further three churches whose remains cannot be reached.[5] Archaeological and historical research has shown that all these buildings were designed to have hall naves with a pair or a single pillar in the middle.[6] Of all these only the Holy Cross church survives in its original state. It has triradial nave vaults supported by a central pillar. The reconstructions of the others, based on the locations of the pillars and side buttresses, suggested that most of them also had (at least in part) triradial vaults (Figs 4 and 5).

Many scholars have considered the origin of the double nave with axial pillars and the phenomenon of its popularity in the eastern part of Central Europe in the fourteenth century. The links were shown between Austrian mendicant churches e.g. in Imbach, Dürnstein, and Enns, and the Bohemian churches for example in Miličín, Třeboň, and Bavorov.[7] Only a few provincial single pillar churches survive in the formerly Hungarian and now Slovakian region of Spiš (Zips in German), and many others were completely destroyed during Turkish invasion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[8] In Poland too, numerous axial-pillar churches were built in the province of Lesser Poland in mid-fourteenth century. King Kazimir the Great founded a group of such churches in small towns such as Wiślica, Szydłów, Stopnica, Niepołomice, and Kargow (Fig. 6).

The "iconography" or "meaning" of these axial-pillar structures has been explained using the iconography of their sculpted vault bosses. In Wiślica and in Stopnica all the bosses are decorated with the coats of arms of Polish noblemen and those of Polish provinces, and thus can be seen as signifying the Kingdom of Poland – its representatives and its territory. At least in two of these churches (in Wiślica and Niepołomice) the royal arms with a white eagle were placed over the east bay of the presbytery, just above the high altar, the place traditionally reserved for sacred themes. This unique iconography has led to a hypothesis that some of the king's churches were used as venues for royal courts of justice. That is supported by the fact that in the fourteenth century Wiślica, Stopnica and Szydłów functioned as centres of judicial provinces. Thus it has been accepted that the royal double-nave hall churches and their decoration were designed to embody the idea of royal justice.[9]

It is clear that the small double-nave churches in Krakow belong to the same type as the churches described above. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that they functioned as venues of local courts. Other scholars stressed the importance of pillars which could be interpreted as symbols of Christ and the Virgin.[10] It may be worth returning to Krautheimer and Sedlmayr's hypothesis that the emergence of the double-nave church with axial pillars was a manifestation of Late Medieval devotion.[11]

In the absence of firm written evidence this hypothesis will remain circumstantial supported only by the material sources, i.e. by the churches themselves. But considering the status of Krakow in the restored Polish Kingdom, it is obvious that the patrons and designers of the four Krakow basilicas intended their monumental interiors to convey the splendour of the royal capital town. It is important

[5] St Martin's church in the Old Town, the church of St Philip and James in Kleparz and St Stanislas's pilgrimage sanctuary in Kazimierz.

[6] Magdalena Goras, *Zaginione gotyckie kościoły Krakowa*, Krakow, 2003.

[7] Dobroslav Líbal, "Gotická architektura", in *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění*, vol. 1, ed. Rudolf Chadraba, Prague, 1984, p. 195-199; Klára Benešovská et al., *Architecture of the Gothic*, Prague, 2001, p. 226, and p. 228-229.

[8] Juraj Žáry, *Dvojloďové kostoly na Spiši* , Bratislava, 1986.

[9] Jerzy Gadomski, "Funkcja kościołów fundacji Kazimierza Wielkiego w świetle heraldycznej rzeźby architektonicznej", in *Funkcja dzieła sztuki*, ed. Jan Białostocki et al., Warsaw, 1972, p. 103-117; Crossley, *Gothic Architecture in the Reign of Kazimir the Great,* p. 216.

[10] Discussed in Crossley, *Gothic Architecture in the Reign of Kazimir the Great,* p. 220-221; Žáry, *Dvojloďové kostoly na Spiši*, p. 73-77; Goras, *Zaginione gotyckie kościoły Krakowa*, p. 136-137.

[11] Discussed in Wolfgang Götz, *Zentralbau und Zentralbautendenze in der gotische Architektur*, Berlin, 1968, p. 105-106; and Crossley, *Gothic Architecture in the Reign of Kazimir the Great*, p. 213.

a)

b)

Fig. 6. a. Collegiate church in Wiślica. b. Parish church in Stopnica (after *Architektura gotycka w Polsce,* ed. Teresa Mroczko & Marian Arszynski, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1995)

to remember that all these huge basilicas were begun just after 1340 and in this year the Corpus Christi feast was introduced in Krakow as liturgical *festum fori*. There is no doubt, that the cult of the Eucharist may have been one of the main reasons for these foundations to have been made. The main parish church of Kazimierz - the newly settled satellite town outside the capital's defensive walls – was founded by the king and was dedicated to Corpus Christi. Moreover the main parish church of Krakow's Old Town, St Mary's, was enriched by a sculptural programme: twelve figures in choir can be interpreted as *communio apostolorum*, and twenty others in nave as *communio sanctorum* – both ideas strongly connected with eucharistic liturgy.

The axial-pillar structures with decorated triradial vaults, executed by royal masons, became influential models replicated in several churches in the town. On the one hand, their popularity can be seen as palpable evidence of the strong influence of king Kazimir's foundations or rather as an expression of local tradition imbued with royal connotations. On the other hand, this type of church interior may have also developed in response to a new spiritual climate of the Late Middle Ages. Actually, according to the four-stage biblical exegesis, the stone pillar can be seen as an allegory of the True Cross, in moral (tropological) interpretation as the Tree of Paradise and finally, the anagogical interpretation understands the pillar with twelve ribs as the tree standing in the middle of Heavenly Jerusalem as seen by St John in his vision of the Last Judgment.

The King and His Patronage: Sigismund I the Elder and the Royal Castle on Wawel Hill in Krakow

Tomasz Torbus

The artistic merit, monumentality, the early date of its construction, and last but not least the good state of its preservation, make the Royal Castle on Wawel Hill in Krakow one of the most important examples of the reception of Italian art north of the Alps (Figs 1, 2, 3). Without outlining the current state of research, which despite a large number of monographs, lectures, and articles devoted to the monument from the time of Austro-Hungarian monarchy until the present,[1] is far from satisfactory, I will present a brief account of the history of the castle. To a certain degree, it will offer here for the first time a new perspective on the building activity on this important site.[2] My research has traced the channels of transmission of certain architectural forms, both imported from Italy and local and their mutual relationship. It has also questioned the long-standing claim of the purity of the Renaissance style, offering instead an equally fascinating and challenging perspective on its architecture as a splendid example of the fusion of the Gothic and Renaissance styles, a *modus* which King Sigmund I the Elder (1506-1548) was well aware of and which he chose deliberately.[3]

Some sources record a fire in 1499.[4] The Gothic structure probably suffered little damage but the fire apparently provided an impulse for a thorough refurbishment. Already during the reign of King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania Alexander I (1501-1506), the construction of the L-shaped palace in the late Gothic style was begun – which was later to become the west wing and the west section of the north wing (Fig. 2). After the new king, Sigismund I the Elder, was crowned in 1506, this part was adorned with elements such as window frames and oriels in the up-to-date style of the Florentine Renaissance (Fig. 4). The master mason Francescus Italus, *architectus insignis*,[5] had already worked for the future king on the tomb of his brother, King Jan Olbracht (1492-1501), at Krakow Cathedral, executed before 1503 and generally regarded as the first example of Renaissance in Poland. Thus elevated to the position of the castle's new architect, Francescus finished the first palace over the following decade. He extended it towards the east and connected with the Gothic sections of the residence. Most probably around 1511 Francescus also started the construction of the loggias of the west wing, and some years later also of the north wing.

[1] The only monograph on the castle to date is Stanisław Tomkowicz, *Wawel*, vol. 1: *Zabudowania Wawelu i ich dzieje*, Krakow (Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicyi Zachodniej 4), 1908. The sources on the construction of the castle were published in the second volume of this series: *Materyały archiwalne do budowy zamku zebrał i wydał (etc…)*, ed. Adam Chmiel (Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicji Zachodniej, 5), Krakow, 1913. Among many other publications a few syntheses should be mentioned in which the castle plays an important role: Jan Białostocki, *The Art of the Renaissance in Eastern Europe, Hungary. Bohemia. Poland*, Ithaca & New York, 1976. Helena & Stefan Kozakiewicz, *The Renaissance in Poland*, Warsaw, 1976; Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Court, Cloister, and City. The Art and Culture of Central Europe 1450-1800*, London, 1995. *Polen im Zeitalter der Jagiellonen 1386-1572* (exhibition catalogue Schallaburg), Vienna, 1986.

[2] The research has been undertaken for the project "Die Jagiellonen in der Kunst und Kultur Mitteleuropas 1454 – 1572", which took place between 2000-2006 at the Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Ostmitteleuropas in Leipzig. My monograph on the subject of the Jagiellonian kings' residences in Poland and Lithuania is in preparation for the publication.

[3] The subject of artistic activities on the court of Sigismund I is comprehensively discussed recently in: Mieczysław Morka, *Sztuka na dworze Zygmunta Starego*, Warsaw, 2007.

[4] *Kronika Polonorum von Marcin Bielski. Cracoviae 1587*, ed. Kazimierz Józef Turowski, vols. 1-3, Sanok & Warsaw, 1851-1856, vol. 1, p. 909. Another source is listed by Tomkowicz, 1908/I, p. 219.

[5] *JODOCI LODOVICI DECII de Sigismundi regis temporibus liber 1521*, ed. Wiktor Czermak, Krakow, 1901 (Biblioteka piśmiennictwa polskiego, 39), p. 130.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100140

Fig. 1. Guache of the Wawel Castle, Krakow, 1536-1537, anonymous painter in the travelling court of Count Palatinate Ottheinrich (*Die Reisebilder Pfalzgraf Ottheinrichs aus den Jahren 1536/37 von seinem Ritt von Neuburg a.d. Donau über Prag nach Krakau und zurück über Breslau, Berlin, Wittenberge und Leipzig nach Neuburg*, ed. Angelika von Marsch, Josef H. Biller & Frank-Dietrich Jacob, vol. 1: Faksimile, vol. 2: Kommentarband, Weissenhorn 2000, Reisebild 26, Albumblatt 49)

Fig. 2. Wawel Castle, Krakow, plan of the ground floor: west wing (bottom of the picture), north wing (left), east wing (top), south wing (right) (Stanisław Tomkowicz, *Wawel*, vol. 1: *Zabudowania Wawelu i ich dzieje*, Krakow (Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicyi Zachodniej 4), 1908, plate 39)

Fig. 3. Wawel Castle, Krakow, northwest corner of the arcaded courtyard (Tomasz Torbus 2007)

The involvement of the next builder of the Wawel Castle, Florence Bartholomeo Berrecci, a native of Pontassieve, has been traditionally seen as being limited to continuing his predecessor's work. He had been brought to Poland in 1516 to erect the Sigismund Chapel in Krakow Cathedral, which – proud of his skill and conscious of his role – he signed with the famous inscription: *Bartholo Florentino opifice*.[6] He was first mentioned in connection with the Royal Castle quite late, in 1527. Historical, stylistic, and biographical arguments suggest that the present form of the arcades owes much more to Berrecci than to his predecessor.[7] The sources confirm his involvement in the construction of the Sigismund Chapel from 1517 and of the Royal Castle from 1527,[8] but there are good reasons to believe that this had started earlier. He probably finished the loggias of the west and north wings in the course of 1517 and 1518 and topped them with the upper floor employing bold structural solutions (Fig. 3). The brilliance of the structural solutions makes this attribution very likely considering the newly-

[6] The best monographic study of the chapel is: Stanisław Mossakowski, *Kaplica Zygmuntowska (1515-1533). Problematyka artystyczna ideowa mauzoleum króla Zygmunta I,* Warsaw, 2007. The English version of the book is due to be published in 2012.

[7] The majority of art historians connect the loggias with Francescus Italus. Only Zachwatowicz and Miłobędzki attributed them to Berrecci, but dated the castle's arcaded galleries to the 1530s, which is inconsistent with the sources. Jan Zachwatowicz, *Architektura polska*, Warsaw, 1966, p. 145. Adam Miłobędzki, *Zarys dziejów architektury w Polsce*, Warsaw, 1968, p. 121; Adam Miłobędzki, "Architektur in Polen zur Zeit der Jagiellonen", in *Polen im Zeitalter der Jagiellonen*, 1984, p. 112-130, here p. 125.

[8] *Materyały archiwalne*, p. 69.

Fig. 4 Wawel Castle, Krakow, west wing, detail of the courtyard facade showing oriel and window (Tomasz Torbus 2007)

discovered and stunning fact that he was also the builder of the first elliptical dome in the history of architecture – in the Sigismund Chapel.[9]

Along with Berreccci, whose involvement in 1517-1530 was limited to the loggias and the upper floor of the east wing, Master Benedict, a prominent mason and stone carver, executed the Gothic-cum-Renaissance portals on the ground and first floor of the east wing. A somewhat obscure figure, he is referred to only once as *Alamanus*[10] and is sometimes considered to have been a German from Upper Hungary. In fact we know very little. His nickname, "of Sandomierz" was only invented in the ninetieth century in connection with his confirmed contribution to the construction of the local castle. Recent studies have also contributed tentative identifications,[11] or purely speculative attempts

[9] The Sigismund Chapel is covered with an elliptical coffered dome. According to American scholar Gregory Todd Harwell it is the earliest example in history of architecture, a fact confirmed by the recent survey. Gregory Todd HARWELL,"The Sigismund Chapel and the Renaissance of Mathematics", in *Die Jagiellonen. Kunst und Kultur einer europäischen Dynastie an der Wende zur Neuzeit*, ed. Dietmar POPP & Robert SUCKALE, Nuremberg, 2002, p. 365-374; Ireneusz PŁUSKA, Jan MARCZAK & Antoni SARZYŃSKI, "Kopuła Kaplicy Zygmuntowskiej. Paraboloida, hiperboloida czy elipsoida?", in *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, 67/1-2, 2005, p. 163-171.

[10] Archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie, Acta Episcopalia (Liber Vitae) 2, fol. 102r.: "Benedictus almanus murator Regie Mtis...".

[11] Tomasz RATAJCZAK, *Mistrz Benedykt, królewski architekt Zygmunta I Starego*, Krakow, 2011.

to identify him with Benedikt Ried.[12] Thus, they do not bring us any closer to solving the mystery of Benedict's artistic roots.

The screen wall in the south and the monumental gateway in the west wings were built by Berrecci in the 1530s, after Benedict's position at the court had been jeopardized, possibly because of accusations of heresy and bigamy. The major fire of 1536 and the death of Bartholomeo Berrecci, the fourth successive architect to supervise the remodelling of the castle – stabbed in the Krakow's Rynek in 1537 by a fellow Italian artist jealous of his success and obvious monopoly on the reconstruction – effectively ended the Renaissance phase of its construction. The project stalled and the complex was left unfinished. It seems likely that there were plans for screening off the auxiliary buildings housing the royal kitchens on south-west side of the castle (from 1518) with a wall with arcaded galleries which would eventually be extended to enclose the entire courtyard.

The subsequent history of Wawel Castle is beyond the scope of the present paper but it is worthwhile to point those developments that have influenced our present ability to dissect and analyse the construction phases.[13] The castle suffered after 1536 from at least seven fires, including two in 1595. Fire damage and successive refurbishments contributed to the fact that except for portals and assorted ceilings and friezes, no other original elements of the Renaissance residence have survived in the Royal Castle's interiors. The main obstacle to the interpretation of the Royal Castle's architecture is the extensive conservation and restoration programme whose successive phases unfolded over a prolonged period of time. As a symbol of the power and glory of the Jagiellonian dynasty, Wawel Castle has often been dressed up in elements of historicizing costume. For example, following the fire of 1702, a number of capitals were reconstructed in pseudo-Renaissance forms. It is well known that the refurbishment of Wawel Castle, converted into barracks and for a century used by Austrian troops before they finally ceased stationing there, was very controversial. It suffices to recall the criticism directed against the local conservators of Western Galicia, particularly Max Dvořák's vocal opposition to Zygmunt Hendel's concept of rebuilding Wawel Castle modelled after the chateaux on the Loire, and Dvořák's bleak prognosis for the royal castle's future. With a considerable dose of arrogance, Dvořák sees the plans to rebuild Wawel Castle as "an embarrassing manifestation of the weakness of artistic culture that ignores the insurmountable difference between the original historic work and its modern imitation". Dvořák warns that the royal castle will be destroyed as a result of refurbishment and reconstruction and become a ruin once again "not in the word's literal meaning but the ruin of the spiritual and artistic power it once embodied".[14] Indeed, following Zygmunt Hendel's restoration project the majority of the original elements of the arcades were removed around 1912: only 18 capitals and 3 ornate shaft rings were left in situ but no column bases.

Since little has been left of the original architecture and the sources give little specific information about their provenance, it seems worthwhile to analyse several selected architectural forms characteristic of the castle: to discern their genesis and develop a method for their stylistic comparison.

The Italian provenance of the arcaded courtyard of Wawel Castle is obvious. Measuring approximately 60 by 50 metres, it is perhaps the biggest courtyard of this kind in Europe outside Rome,

[12] Urszula Borkowska, "Gothic-Renaissance Royal Residences in Poland", in *Die Länder der Böhmischen Krone und ihre Nachbarn zur Zeit der Jagiellonenkönige (1471-1526)*, ed. Evelin Wetter (Studia Jagiellonica Lipsiensia 2), Ostfildern, 2004, p. 105-114.

[13] Paweł Dettloff, Marcin Fabiański & Andrzej Fischinger, *Zamek królewski na Wawelu. Sto lat odbudowy (1905-2005)*, Krakow, 2005.

[14] Max Dvořák, "Restaurierungsfragen: II. Das Königsschloss am Wawel", in *Kunstgeschichtliches Jahrbuch der K.K. Zentralkommission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst und historischen Denkmale* (Beiblatt zum Band II, Beiblatt für Denkmalpflege 4), Vienna, 1908, p. 105-112; and also in Polish: Max Dvořák, "Problemy restauracji zabytków II. Zamek królewski na Wawelu", in *Wokół Wawelu. Antologia tekstów z lat 1901-1909*, ed. Jarosław Krawczyk, p. 142-146; here quoted after Krawczyk, p. 142 and 146 (translated by the author).

in the first half of the sixteenth century. While considering its general resemblance to, for example, the courtyard of the Palazzo della Cancellaria (1486-1498), Cortile di San Damaso in the Vatican (1503-1519) or the Vatican's open loggia (known only from the Maerten van Heemskercks' drawing),[15] it is hard to find an analogy for some details of this monumental structure with two arcaded storeys topped with a high upper loggia in the so-called architrave solution – where the columns support the roof without an arcade. The slender columns of the second floor are over seven meters high (excluding the pedestals), twice as tall as those of the ground and first floor (Fig. 3). The reasons for this unique solution lie first of all in the unusual height of the second floor of Wawel Castle. The designer of the castle's west wing (of circa 1504) – thought by some scholars to be the Krakow guild mason Eberhard of Coblenz[16] – placed the *piano nobile* with state rooms on the second floor following a medieval tradition common north of the Alps.[17] The later decision to expand the residence, that is to convert the first L-shaped palace into a wing of a larger complex and to add loggias, resulted in the need to adjust the height of the new columns to the height of the existing second floor with its high ceilings.

Lech Kalinowski has been the first to see the link between the ornate shaft rings of the Wawel columns on the second floor and mediaeval architecture by pointing to the ring on the respond as a favourite device used by Gothic architects (Fig. 2). Sometimes its structural function of engaging the respond with the wall or with other columns appears to have been forgotten and the motif is often used as pure decoration during the transitional period between Gothic and the Renaissance. We encounter it whenever the Renaissance becomes "contaminated" with Gothic, Islamic or "Oriental" forms, for example in the architecture of Venice and also in the monuments of Isabella and Manuel's Portugal demonstrating the characteristic *horror vacui* and apprehension of the column's unobstructed verticality. Similar features are found in mediaeval structures in central Italy, e.g. arcaded cloisters in Bologna as well as in Renaissance buildings such as Como Cathedral (circa 1500), the Portinari Chapel at the Santo Eustorgio Basilica in Milan (1462-1468), or San Vitale in Ravenna (remodelled around 1500). In the German countries this detail often features on brass monuments, for example on some Nuremberg tombs by the Vischer family, or in windows (e.g. Regensburg Cathedral), or portals, but as far as I know, not in freestanding monumental architecture. Still, of all the examples quoted above only the Wawel shaft rings perform the function of binding together two columns of exceptional height. A talented architect could have come up with the idea of employing them in Krakow. Since similar features appear in architecture of different countries and periods, it seems pointless to try to specify its origins as being more southern or northern European.

Much more fascinating seem the imposts located above the top tier of columns nicknamed "vases" by Pryliński and Tomkiewicz (Fig. 5). Narrower than the Ionic capitals on which they rest, they appear to contradict the stability of the structure. Doubtless employed on purpose, they apparently play with proportions as if engaging in a purely visual play with the forces of gravity. They seem an idiosyncratic dissonance in the syncretic but sober architecture of Wawel Castle. Although there are examples where imposts have been reduced to small plump balusters on freestanding columns,[18] it seems very likely that the Wawel "vases" have no direct precedent. The underlying idea was so refined

[15] Built in 1514 after a design by Michelangelo. Fischinger even maintains that it might have influenced directly the arcaded galleries of Wawel Castle (Andrzej Fischinger, "Rzymskie odniesienia renesansowego Zamku Królewskiego na Wawelu", in *Folia Historiae Artium*, Seria Nowa 4, 1998, p. 225-230).

[16] Andrzej Fischinger, "Pałac Króla Aleksandra na Wawelu", in *Rocznik Krakowski*, 56, 1990, p. 79-93.

[17] Giving the second floor the rank of a piano nobile belongs to Central European tradition rooted in the Middle Ages (Rochlitz in Saxony, with its two upper storeys intermingling residential and ceremonial functions) that was still alive in the Renaissance period, e.g. at the so-called German Wing of the residence of the dukes of Bavaria-Landshut in Landshut (after 1536) or the residence of Duke Ottheinrich von Pfalz-Neuburg at Neuburg on the Danube (after 1537). It was very common in residential towers (Siedlęcin in Silesia or later Szamotuły and Piotrków Trybunalski).

[18] E.g. the column placed in front of the west front of the Duomo in Siena. It is found again in sixteenth-century Poland.

Fig 5. Wawel Castle, Krakow, two "vases" on the upper gallery of the east wing (Tomasz Torbus 2007)

that it had no followers. [19] The reason for employing them was probably the need to separate the loggia zone from the sloping roof which was a necessary concession to the local climate. The "vases" also prevent the column and its capital from getting obscured by the projecting eaves, letting it take the pride of place. Although this theory does not explain their diminutive dimensions it provides a logical interpretation of this most Mannerist element in the architecture of Wawel Castle.

The castle's courtyard facades and interiors contain 23 stonework portals whose refined and unique forms have long attracted scholarly interest. Their principal feature is the combination of Late Gothic tracery with Renaissance cornices. The earliest portals, designated for the west wing, were carved around 1507 in Pińczów limestone. Their forms are simplified and the mingling of disparate Late Gothic and Renaissance elements seems somewhat awkward and heterogeneous. Francescus Italus was the likely designer or carver of the Italianate cornice, while the tracery could have been designed by one of the Upper Hungarian members of his workshop. Either Francescus or the patron of the castle himself came up with the idea of combining the two elements: it proved successful and was subsequently adapted to other portals at Wawel Castle as well.

Thus, the east wing, begun in 1520, contains analogous portals whose forms are more complex and seamlessly integrated. They have been attributed to Master Benedict and his stone carvers. The portals in the Wawel Castle's east wing feature jambs that are flush with the surrounding wall and consist of multiple bars resting on diamond-shaped bases. The shafts extend into the lintel where they cross and interpenetrate at various angles and on various planes. The lintel features an ornate cornice

[19] It is found again in sixteenth-century Poland only once by Padovano in the gable walls of the Cloth Hall in Krakow.

Fig. 6. Wawel Castle, Krakow, drawing of a portal in the east wing with a lintel inscription (Stanisław Tomkowicz, *Wawel*, vol. 1: *Zabudowania Wawelu i ich dzieje*, Krakow (Teka Grona Konserwatorów Galicyi Zachodniej 4), 1908, plate 46)

decorated with ornaments: egg and dart, disc moulding, plate moulding, acanthus leaves, interlace ornaments and ribbon-wrapped bars. Some lintels also feature Renaissance motifs: rosettes, suns, putto heads, mermaids, cornucopias, heraldic shields, and knotted bands; others have been separated from the cornice by a frieze with a Latin inscription, including the famous *Nihil sine Causa* on the portal of the *locum secretum* (Fig. 6). In this group of portals the cornice and lintel have been fused into a single homogeneous work. It is worthy of note that in some portals the Renaissance frieze has been carved in one piece with the Late Gothic lintel rather than the Renaissance cornice. Several scholars, including Jan Białostocki,[20] have tried to decipher the genesis of the Wawel portals but most of the (rare) analogies – portals in Miechów, Wąchock, Tarnów, Jaromír in Bohemia or Sobótka in Silesia – they have identified seem to have been inspired by the Wawel portals and not the other way around.

In conclusion, the unique character of the architecture of Wawel Castle cannot be classified as purely Tuscan Renaissance nor as North Apine architecture with an Italian twist, whatever territory this "northerness" is assumed to relate to - Krakow, Southern Germany, or Upper Hungary. The construction of the royal residence at any given stage was supervised by two architects, one of them Italian, the other of Central European descent. The first such tandem was possibly Eberhard and Franciscus Italus, the second – Benedict and Berrecci. The "locals" tended to focus on the building's architecture while the Italians on the decoration although this arrangement was occasionally modified by both parties.

Instrumental in imposing this organisation, the division of labour, and the choice of style for the castle was the patron, King Sigismund the Elder (1506-1548; Fig. 7), who, according to many sources, personally defined the architects' respective areas of responsibility. As a young prince, Sigismund spent a total of three and a half years in Hungary where he became acquainted with the royal castles in Buda and Nyék which were under construction at the time.[21] This experience apparently resulted in the future monarch's preference for the Renaissance style demonstrated in his employing Italians as stone masons and his choice of building materials (often the red marble from the area of Esztergom).

[20] Jan Białostocki, "Remarks on doorways between late Gothic and Renaissance. North and South of the Carpathians", in *Acta Historiae Artium*, 28, 1982, p. 247-253.

[21] New research has revealed that those were not completed during the reign of Matthias Corvinus but later, after 1490, in the time of his succesor Vladislav II Jagiellon (Sigismund's brother), who also remodelled it to a great extent; Nyék was even newly constructed. István Feld, "Die Bauten König Wladislaws II und die Verbreitung der Renaissance-Architektur in Ungarn. Die Rolle und die Bedeutung der archäologischen Forschung und der zeichnerischen Rekonstruktion", in *Die Jagiellonen*, p. 307-316; Tomasz Torbus, "Myth and Reality: Remarks of the Hungarian Influences on the Architecture in Poland and Lithuania around 1500", in *Colloquia. Journal of Central European History*, 10-11/1-2, 2003-2004, Cluj, 2004, p. 230-239.

Fig. 7. ?Hans Suess von Kulmbach, Sigismund the Elder, Zamek w Gołuchowie, Oddział Muzeum Narodowego w Poznaniu (Stanisław Mossakowski, *Kaplica Zygmuntowska (1515-1533). Problematyka artystyczna ideowa mauzoleum króla Zygmunta I.*, Warsaw, 2007, ill. 1)

In his letter from 1517 to Wawel's governor Jan Boner, concerning the model of the Sigismund Chapel presented by Berrecci, the monarch recommended some modifications.[22] The king's personal involvement in the architectural form is also confirmed by the sources published by his secretary Jodocus Lodovicus Decius in 1521. He reports that "the king has spent decades erecting from scratch and at great expense two palaces with an amazing and of him only characteristic cleverness so that one does not know what to admire more: the architect's royal splendour or the king's artistic sense [...]", especially admiring "the third ambulatory […] fitted with lofty and splendid columns and its ceiling sprinkled with gold rosettes".[23] This suggests that the king had his own architectural vision, even if we allow for the writer's courtly exaggeration. Sigismund's interest in architecture is also confirmed by an unidentified treaty on architecture (probably by Vitruvius) acquired around 1500 in Hungary which he had in his library.[24]

His interests in Italian art deepened after 1518, following his marriage to Bona Sforza (1494-1557). But contrary to suggestions in some older literature, this was not the true advent of the Renaissance in Poland, but rather a stimulus in terms of quantity rather than quality: among her Italian entourage of 287, there must have been some artists as well. Bona, who as a young woman had lived in Naples, was certainly open to Renaissance art: it suffices to mention her unrealised idea of bringing Sebastiano Serlio to Poland as a court architect after the death of Berrecci.[25] However, she could not have influenced the architecture of Wawel Castle for the obvious reason that at the moment of her arrival two of its arcaded wings had already been completed. Her later involvement in artistic decisions concerning Wawel Castle is possible but remains speculative due to lack of sources. And we know that it was the king, who preferred to be represented in the fashionable Renaissance costume on commemorative monuments, such as the aforementioned royal mausoleum in the cathedral. Likewise, the facades and courtyards of residential buildings show off the monarch's familiarity with the latest trends in architecture and his predilection for royal splendour as an effective means of glorifying the dynasty. On the other hand, in interiors he apparently favoured the time-tested Late Gothic style or symbiotic forms.

Many structures erected throughout Central Europe in the early sixteenth century exemplify attempts to modernise traditional architecture by employing Italian stone masons to update old residences with fashionable details. But Wawel Castle does not fit in this mould thanks to the skill of the Italian stone masters who had also proved talented architects, and to the patrons' vision. The intermingling of the two high-quality aesthetic idioms has resulted in a new aesthetic quality. The Wawel portals show how this process of fusing the old with the new unfolded resulting in a "style between styles",[26] which in this case could also be termed "the syncretic style of the Jagiellonians".

Without suggesting any connection, it is instructive to recall here another example of "the Jagiellonian style", close to Wawel in terms of both chronology and genealogy: the inspiring intermingling of Gothic and Renaissance in the castle of Vladislav II Jagiellon in Benedikt Ried's work on Prague

[22] *Kaplica Zygmuntowska*, *Materiały źródłowe 1517-1977*, ed. Antoni Franaszek & Bolesław Przybyszewski, Krakow, 1991, p. 3.

[23] *"…Singulari et propria industria, ut nescias, an plus regiam magnificentiam in artifice, an artificiorum ingenium in rege mirari debeas [etc...]","Desriptio Diarii in nuptiis Serenisseme Bone, Regine Polonie. Per Jodocum Jostum Decium"*, in *Acta Tomiciana*, vol. 4, Poznań, 1516 & 1518, p. 298-327, here p. 320-321.

[24] The source has been cited in: Adolf Pawiński, *Młode lata Zygmunt Starego*, Warsaw, 1893, p. 258.

[25] As reported by the French ambassador in Venice, Bishop Guillame Pellicier in 1540 to Margaret d'Angouleme, the queen of Navarre. He finally succeeded in summoning Serlio to the court in Fontainebleau. The original sources are quoted in Jerzy Kowalczyk, *Sebastiano Serlio a sztuka polska. O roli włoskich traktatów architektonicznych w dobie nowożytnej*. Wrocław, Warsaw, Krakow & Gdańsk, 1973, p. 28.

[26] Hellmut Lorenz, "Spätgotik und Renaissance in Mitteleuropa – ein "Stil zwischen den Stilen?", in *Die Länder der Böhmischen Krone*, p. 31-48.

Fig. 8. Prague Castle, Vladislav Hall, 1490-1502, general view of the interior (Ústav dějin umění, Akademie věd České republiky, Prague)

Castle (the Vladislav Hall, 1490-1502; and the Ludwig wing, 1502-1509),[27] where Renaissance windows and portals are in perfect harmony with curvilinear Gothic vaulting of scale unparalleled in temporal architecture of the period (Fig. 8). In both cases we encounter a conscious play between tradition and innovation aimed at creating some specific artistic "vocabulary" that would glorify the Jagiellonians as a dynasty whose ambitions if not political power rivalled that of the Habsburgs.

[27] Götz Fehr, *Benedikt Ried, Ein deutscher Baumeister zwischen Gotik und Renaissance in Böhmen*, Munich, 1961.

The Košice Burghers and their Blood. Church Building and Cult Management in Late Medieval Hungary[1]

Tim Juckes

It was the breadth of Paul Crossley's research interests and the pan-European coverage of his taught courses that first encouraged me to look to medieval Hungary for a PhD subject. In dealing with the material itself, his ability to unlock a building history by combining insight into masonic design with a profound understanding of patronal priorities was always a source of inspiration. With the late Gothic parish church of St Elizabeth in Košice (Kassa, Kaschau; present-day Slovakia), which was rebuilt circa 1390-1490, his approach seemed particularly suggestive for a monument whose pivotal position in inter-regional stylistic developments had long been recognised, but where a range of more specific, building-historical questions remained unresolved (Figs 1-2).[2]

One such question is the extent to which cult management played a role in the church's planning. A papal bull of 1 March 1402 mentions the famous blood relic kept at St Elizabeth's and the crowds of pilgrims, including non-believers from neighbouring lands, that flocked to the church.[3] The bull also implies that ensuring the relic's proper storage and display were foremost in the minds of the burghers as they continued with rebuilding work, which had already been begun following a fire at the old church. It was so that the church could be "more handsomely rebuilt and finished, and then visited with due honour" that the pope offered his assistance.[4] The relic itself, however, has long since disappeared, and perhaps for this reason has received little attention in the art historical literature on the church.[5] It was only when Paul Crossley drew my attention to the unusual scale of Boniface IX's indulgences for visitors to Košice – a plenary concession on the model of S. Marco's in Venice and S. Maria de Portiuncula near Assisi – that I began to think further about the cult's possible significance in the development of the church's unusual design.[6]

A difficulty here remains the limited documentary evidence relating to the relic. Whilst there are several fifteenth- and sixteenth-century references to the town's popularity as a pilgrimage destina-

[1] The research for this essay was made possible by the support of the Art and Humanities Research Council and the Leverhulme Trust.

[2] On St Elizabeth's, with references to further literature, see: Václav Mencl, "Die Kaschauer Kathedrale", in *Südost-Forschungen*, 8, 1943, p. 110-155; Ernő Marosi, "Die zentrale Rolle der Bauhütte von Kaschau. Studium zur Baugeschichte der Pfarrkirche St. Elisabeth um 1400", in *Acta Historiae Artium*, 15, 1969, p. 25-75; Sandor Tóth, "Kaschau, Elisabethkirche, von der Westfassade her betrachtet", in *Művészettörténeti Értesítő*, 42, 1993, p. 113-139; Tim Juckes, *St. Elizabeth's in Košice. Town, Court and Church-Building in Late Medieval Hungary*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2008.

[3] *Cum itaque, sicut accepimus, parochialis ecclesia beate Elizabeth Cassoviensis, Agriensis diocesis, in qua gloriosus sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi a longis retroactis temporibus miraculose est inventus, et ad eam fidelium et infidelium, utpote Olachorum et Ruthenorum, inibi confinantium, propter sepius inibi illucentia divinitus miracula confluit multitudo…*; published in *Monumenta Vaticana historiam regni Hungariae illustrantia*, ed. Vilmos Fraknói et al., vol. 1, part 4, Budapest, 1889, p. 417-418.

[4] *Nos cupientes ut ecclesia ipsa decentius reparetur, consumetur et etiam congruis honoribus frequentetur…*; *ibidem*, p. 417.

[5] It is only occasionally touched on. See especially: Marosi, "Die zentrale Rolle", p. 33-35; Ernő Marosi, "Centralizujúce tendencie v architectúre Uhorska okolo roku 1400", in *Kolokvium Život a dielo Václava Mencla na Slovensku (zborník)*, ed. Patrik Guldan, Bratislava, 1999, p. 161, 168. On the Košice blood relic in its Hungarian context, see Gábor Tüskés & Éva Knapp, "Die Verehrung des Heiligen Blutes in Ungarn: Ein Überblick", in *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 10, 1987, p. 179-201.

[6] The indulgences were available to all those who, on the feast of Sts Philip and James, and the three following days, visited the church and contributed to the rebuilding.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100141

Fig. 1. Košice, parish church of St Elizabeth, rebuilt circa 1390-1490, groundplan (from Ernő Marosi, "Tanulmányok a kassai Szent Erzsébet templom építéstörténetéhez II", in *Művészettörténeti értesítő*, 18, 1969, p. 90)

Fig. 2. St Elizabeth's, Košice, west end, reconstruction drawing of pre-restoration condition, based on archive material, by Kálmán Lux, 1945 (Budapest, Kulturális Örökségvédelmi Hivatal, Tervtár, Lux 692)

tion, the written sources offer no specific information about the blood's safekeeping at St Elizabeth's.[7] There is no mention of a blood chapel at the church, nor is there any trace of a blood altar or monstrance. The church's fabric, however, does retain several features which can plausibly be linked with the relic. These will be considered here in terms of three main aspects of the cult's management: the long-term storage of the relic, its public display and the advertisement of its presence at St Elizabeth's within the church's integral imagery.

The first aspect is perhaps the most pressing. If the relic was as important as the 1402 bull implies, it surely would have required an appropriately privileged setting. Whilst there is no documented chapel for the relic, a long-forgotten space occupying the first floor of the church's south tower puts itself forward as a strong candidate for a blood sacristy (Figs 3-4).[8] That this was a sacristy of some kind might immediately be suspected from its secure character. The space is accessed by an independent staircase, and this does not connect with the upper stages of the tower, which had a separate staircase system.[9] The first floor is thus deliberately isolated from the rest of the structure and reached only by means of the aforementioned passageway, which is narrow and inconspicuous in form.

[7] For fuller discussion of these sources, see Tüskés & Knapp, "Die Verehrung", p. 180-183; Juckes, *Košice*, p. 59-60.

[8] I am very grateful to Ing. Kristína Markušová, Director of the Regional Monument Office in Košice (Krajský pamiatkový úrad), for first bringing this space to my attention and arranging a visit.

[9] On the unusual staircase system of the south tower, see Martina Schmiedlová, "Točité schodisko južnej veže Dómu sv. Alžbety v Košiciach", in *Dějiny věd a techniky*, 29, 1996, p. 1-18.

Fig. 3. St Elizabeth's, Košice, south tower, view from south (Tim Juckes)

Fig. 4. St Elizabeth's, Košice, south tower, ground plans of ground floor (above, 2) and first floor (below, 3). A broad staircase in the ground-floor space (above, 2) approaches a passage in the tower's north wall that leads through to the church's western organ gallery (*i.e.* to the left of the tower; see also Fig. 1, where the gallery is shown). From within this wall passage, two further passages within the thickness of the wall lead to the upper parts of the tower, one to the first-floor space and one to the stories above (from Martina Schmiedlová, "Točité schodisko južnej veže Dómu sv. Alžbety v Košiciach", in *Dějiny věd a techniky*, 29, 1996, p. 11)

The most striking piece of evidence relating to the room's special function is the niche set within the thickness of its east wall (Fig. 5). Integrated as it is with the vault's springing zone and showing close stylistic relations to other early fifteenth-century work from Košice, the niche is clearly contemporary with the space itself.[10] Nor is it in any sense a conventional fitting for a chapel altar. Rather the niche's generous dimensions – it is almost two meters high – and the lack of any sign of medieval shelving comparable to its present-day fittings suggest that it was intended for the storage of a large sacred object,

[10] For the stylistic connections, see Juckes, *Košice*, p. 155-156.

Fig. 5. St Elizabeth's, Košice, south tower, first-floor sacristy, niche in east wall, by circa 1430 (Tim Juckes)

perhaps a monstrance.[11] That this served as a vehicle for the Košice blood seems an immediate possibility: if the burghers had decided to build such a "special sacristy" for a single object in this period, it would most likely have been for the town's celebrated blood relic. Moreover this suspicion seems to be confirmed by the iconography of the sculptural relief above the niche, which shows a Veronica – with two angels bearing the sudarium used by Christ on the road to Golgotha (Fig. 6). The bloody associations of this image, with the miraculous imprint of Christ's face seeming to spill from its frame, would make it a wholly fitting crown for a blood niche. It would even be reasonable to ask whether the Košice blood, which was known to have been "discovered long ago"[12] in the church, was the result of a Walldürn-style mass miracle, where drops of eucharistic wine spilt on a corporal were believed to have formed an image of Christ's face.[13]

In any case, the first-floor space of the south-west tower appears well suited to the storage of the town's blood relic. The space was on the one hand secure and inaccessible, on the other clearly privileged: it represents an integral part of the most ambitious (if unfinished) tower project undertaken by the medieval town; the room's ample dimensions, meanwhile, contrast with the cramped approach – it is well lit by broad windows on its two outward-facing sides and has a decorative, sexpartite vault.[14] All this would fit well with the relic's importance as described in the written sources.

The south tower sacristy would not, however, have been much use for the second aspect of cult management to be considered here – the relic's public display and veneration. As has been shown, the space was (deliberately) inaccessible and thus inconvenient for mass pilgrimage. Far more suitable would have been the facilities installed in the church's south transept (Figs. 1, 7). This "ensemble" is in fact a two-storey extension to the church's southern arm, comprising a porch with first-floor gallery, which opens through a broad arch into the interior of the church and is accessed via a double-spiral staircase in the south transept.

Whilst there is no documented function for the ensemble, there are several reasons to connect it with the display of the blood relic.[15] In the most general terms, we are dealing with an exceptional and expensive design feature that surely represents a response to specific patronal requirements. That

[11] The niche, including its frame, is 0.99m wide, 1.60m high (to shoulder height, excluding the stepped crown) and 0.45m deep. The Veronica relief measures 0.30m x 0.30m.
[12] See note 3 above.
[13] On Walldürn (Baden Württemberg), see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval North Germany and Beyond*, Philadelphia, 2007, p. 28. See Tüskés & Knapp, "Die Verehrung", p. 190.
[14] The space is almost exactly square in plan with sides circa 3.40m long.
[15] As has recently been suggested in Marosi, "Centralizujúce tendencie", p. 161, 168. Unlike in his earlier monographical

the patron was indeed the town, rather than a private individual, is made clear by the grandeur of conception and prominent situation opposite the church's main north entrance, not to mention the public character of the inscription beneath the gallery balustrade.[16] Perhaps most importantly, the ensemble seems well adapted to the needs of public display. Its staircase, with an interlocking double-spiral design and openwork tracery, would have facilitated impressive, choreographed ascents to the first-floor space, possibly as the high point of a procession. The advantages of the gallery space as a form of relic platform, meanwhile, looking across the church's broad transepts and highly visible for congregations in the space below, are still clearer. It is also significant that the continuation of the spiral staircase into the roof would have allowed direct communication, by means of a roof gallery, with the nearby south-west tower and its sacristy. Were the two design elements perhaps even planned in tandem, with the south transept area conceived as a brilliantly visible counterpart for the blood's south tower stronghold?

Along with the sacristy and gallery, there remains one further aspect of the St Elizabeth's design that can be seen as a likely response to the presence of the blood within the church. This is the integral imagery of the central west portal, which shows three Passion scenes with strikingly bloody connotations: the Agony in the Garden in the tympanum below, with a Pietà and Veronica in two registers above (Fig. 8).[17] The interpretation of the Veronica has already been

Fig. 6. St Elizabeth's, Košice, south tower, first-floor sacristy, Veronica relief, by circa 1430. Whilst the relief appears damaged and has been thoroughly cleaned, it shows various connections with the (more heavily restored) portal reliefs, particularly the west portal Veronica. The design of the niche itself is closely related to the portals' microarchitecture, its stepped crown echoing the church's north portal (Tim Juckes)

Fig. 7. St Elizabeth's, Košice, south transept "ensemble", circa 1430. The Calvary group currently in the south gallery was only moved there in the twentieth century (Tim Juckes)

articles on the church, Marosi now regards a link between the blood and south transept ensemble as plausible, although he still appears to doubt that St Elizabeth's was the permanent home of the relic. Compare to: Marosi, "Die zentrale Rolle", p. 33-35 (and note 16); Juckes, *Košice*, p. 153-155.

[16] The inscription proclaims the legitimate succession of King Ladislaus "Posthumous" in 1440. It can be related to Košice's pro-Ladislaus stance in the civil war following the death of Duke Albert V (from 1438, king Albert II) in 1439.

[17] On the likelihood of a connection between this iconography and the blood relic, see Marosi, "Die zentrale Rolle", p. 35.

Fig. 8. St Elizabeth's, Košice, west portal, by circa 1415 (Budapest, Kulturális Örökségvédelmi Hivatal, Fotótár)

Fig. 9. St Elizabeth's, Košice, west portal, upper relief with Pietà and Veronica, by circa 1410-1420 (Tim Juckes)

touched on, and its inclusion here, as the portal's crowning image, is highly evocative of the south tower sacristy relief (Fig. 9). The Pietà, meanwhile, with Mary cradling her son's crucified body, further stimulates reflection on the blood Christ shed during his final hours. As for the Agony (Fig. 10), the associations are also clear, since St Luke's mention of Christ's bloody sweat on the Mount of Olives is one of the few occasions on which the synoptic gospels refer explicitly to the bleeding of the living Christ: "… and in anguish of spirit he prayed the more urgently; and his sweat was like clots of blood falling to the ground" (Luke 22:44).[18] It was for this reason that the Agony featured so prominently in late medieval meditations on Christ's blood.[19]

Thus whilst the loss of the portal jambs' niche figures (if indeed there ever were any) means that the complete iconographical programme of the portal cannot be reconstructed, it is apparent that we are dealing here not with a comprehensive Passion cycle, but rather with a small selection of events chosen by the patron for a particular reason. That this represented a deliberate reference to the blood is further suggested by a comparison with the imagery (or rather lack thereof) at the church's other portals. The north front presents the most extensive sculptural programme and one fitting for a main entrance, balancing as it does between cornerstones of Christian dogma (Last Judgement and Cruci-

[18] Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, p. 1; see also Marosi, "Die zentrale Rolle", p. 35.

[19] Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, p. 2-3.

Fig. 10. St. Elizabeth's, Košice, west portal, lower relief with the Agony in the Garden, by circa 1415 (Tim Juckes)

fixion) and locally relevant saints (the life and works of the church's patroness, St Elizabeth, with three further Hungarian royal saints appearing in the gable above – Kings Stephen and Ladislaus, and Prince Emerich). The remaining entrances to the church – the western side portals and the south transept portal – were left without further sculptural reliefs. In this way, the church's integral imagery can be seen to respond to the requirements of the town: a richly decorated main entrance looking north across Košice's principal public space towards the town hall, and a "blood portal" to the west in the immediate vicinity of the south tower sacristy.

With St Elizabeth's, then, the evidence of the fabric appears to confirm what was implicit in the 1402 bull – that cult management did indeed play a role in the church's design. Whilst the evidence is far from perfect, several of the church's more unusual characteristics can reasonably be related to the storage, display and advertisement of the blood relic. Faced with this emerging impression that the burghers had a coherent plan for integrating the cult within the town's parish church, it remains to enquire further into the development of their strategy. Were the design elements discussed here all present from the start of works? Is their inclusion indicative of the town's long-term adherence to the original late-fourteenth-century plan or more a matter of ad hoc responses, perhaps related to the growing importance of the cult?

Whilst the chronology of the church's rebuilding is far from straightforward, there is strong evidence that the features in question – the sacristy, gallery and portal reliefs – all pertain to a particular phase of work and were executed at roughly the same time.[20] Work on new St Elizabeth's began

[20] For literature on the building history, see note 2 above.

circa 1390, and an initial phase of operations saw the construction of the outer walls around an older parish church on the same site.[21] In the course of about a decade, the essentials of the plan were established – the pairs of diagonal chapels, the broad transepts and short nave, the twin-tower west end (Fig. 1). Work concentrated on the south and west parts of the church, where the walls reached around three to four meters in height. On the north side and particularly to the north-east, progress was more limited, most likely due to the desire to retain functioning parts of the predecessor church for as long as possible.

In the early 1400s, possibly following a brief pause in operations, the burghers recruited a new master mason and work continued. Old St Elizabeth's was gradually demolished as the new church rose around it, with the high vaults of the successor building finished by circa 1440.[22] It was during this phase of work that the cult-related areas – the first floor of the south tower, south transept and west portal – were completed. It was also at this point that a number of alterations to the original design were undertaken. Whilst the wide-ranging nature of the plan changes is perhaps most apparent in the adoption of a new "bent-rib" star vault scheme, which involved altering the dimensions of the standard bay, it affected many other aspects of the design – including those under consideration here.

The incorporation of the first-floor sacristy in the south tower was part of a large-scale replanning of the tower as a whole (Figs 2 and 3). Having started work on the foundation walls of a structure that was presumably intended to follow the simple pattern of the church's north tower, it was now decided to attempt something far more elaborate. As with so many tower projects of this type, the work was never completed. The ambitious character of the second-phase plan, however, and the completion of its lower stages – including the first-floor sacristy – by circa 1440, at the very latest, can be established on the basis of archaeological and stylistic evidence.[23]

At around the same time as the new plan for the south tower was drawn up, it was also decided to add the two-storey extension to the south transept – the porch-gallery-staircase ensemble already discussed (Fig. 7). That this was not envisaged during the first-phase work is apparent not only in the unbalancing effect the changes had on the church's symmetrically conceived first-phase ground plan, but also in the evidence of adaptation in the south portal and interior support system. The portal's jambs were begun before any porch was planned, and were then partly recut to make way for the porch and its hanging vault. The insertion of the double-spiral staircase, meanwhile, had implications for the wall supports in the south-west corner of the transept: these were now entirely covered by the staircase and thus rendered superfluous, although they can still be seen in places inside the staircase.[24]

The alterations to the church's plan also affected the design of the central west portal. The portal's lower parts were laid out along with the rest of the new church's twin-tower west end, as is reflected in the close stylistic relations between the portal's socles and the established first-phase support system. At the level of the west portal's capital zone, however, there is strong evidence of a plan change (Figs 8, 10). Whilst this cannot be discussed in adequate detail in this context, it suffices to say that the innermost mouldings of the portal jambs fail to continue into, or correspond with, the arch forms of the portal's crown. The capital zone's inner plinth seems to have been designed to hold a dif-

[21] On the achievements of the first-phase work, with further literature, see Juckes, *Košice*, p. 75-99.

[22] On the second-phase operations, see *ibidem*, p. 99-159.

[23] Since the tower supported the nave's side-aisle vaults on two sides, the terminus ante quem of circa 1440 for the completion of the nave also applies to the tower's ground and first floor. On this and the replanning of the tower per se, see: Marosi, "Die zentrale Rolle", p. 40, 68; Ernő Marosi, "Tanulmányok a kassai Szent Erzsébet-templom építéstörténetéhez III", in *Művészettörténeti értesítő*, 20, 1971, p. 261-291, here p. 261-267; Juckes, *Košice*, p. 103-104.

[24] On the addition of the ensemble, see: Tóth, "Kaschau", p. 120; Juckes, *Košice*, p. 84-85, 102-103.

ferent type of tympanum and is left redundant in the executed design: there is clear daylight here between plinth and tympanum.[25]

If these changes paved the way for the unusual portal crowns at St Elizabeth's, which show a characteristic and virtuoso layering of contrasting arch forms, then they can also be associated with the final decisions taken on the matter of the portals' integral imagery. The west portal sculpture is clearly designed for its crown (Figs 8-10). This is most apparent with the Agony relief, which strives to fit its flat-headed, shouldered arch: the left-hand figures become more cramped and stunted with the space as it closes; the fencing behind the sleeping Apostles also follows its frame. Indeed relief and portal crown are very much at one here, since the moulded frame for the sculpture forms the innermost arch of the portal crown itself.

It becomes clear, then, that the final strategy for managing the church's blood relic only emerged during the second-phase work, and was closely associated with changes to the church's plan undertaken at that point. If it remains uncertain what the burghers had in mind at the start of works, then the evidence does at least show that they did not envisage a south tower, south transept ensemble and west portal reliefs of the kind eventually executed. That the second-phase operations in fact resulted in an increased emphasis on the cult within the church's design can be suspected on several grounds. It would correspond with the manner in which the south tower and south transept ensemble not only alter, but expand considerably upon the original plan. It would also correspond with the "late" application to Boniface IX in 1402, many years after the fire and the beginning of rebuilding.[26] It was perhaps even following the "ever more frequent manifestations of divine miracles", mentioned in the bull, that the town decided to take more extensive measures to accommodate the relic and approached the pope for help.[27] The generous papal concessions that ensued, meanwhile, would surely have helped the burghers raise the funds necessary for their ambitious new scheme, as well as recruit a master mason of international standing. Whilst this master's name, along with many other details of the project's direction and financing, remain obscure, the decades after 1402 certainly saw rapid progress on the new church. It was also the achievements of this period in particular that ensured the town's long-term status as a leading architectural centre within the late-medieval region.

[25] On the evidence for plan change in the portals, see: Tóth, "Kaschau", p. 119-120; Juckes, *Košice*, p. 82-85.

[26] According to the bull, the church had burned down "some time ago", whilst substantial repair and rebuilding work had already been undertaken by 1402: *[ecclesia]… olim combusta et de novo per Christicolas inibi commorantes erecta et nundum* (sic) *completa existat*. See *Monumenta Vaticana*, 1/4, p. 417.

[27] *… propter sepius inibi illucentia divinitus miracula…*. See *ibidem*, p. 417.

Architectural Competition in a University Town: The Mendicant Friaries in Late Medieval Louvain

Thomas Coomans

This essay examines how architecture reflects the competition between some religious orders in the changing context of a Late Medieval city with ambitions.[1] In the fifteenth century, Louvain (Leuven in Flemish), the former capital of the Duchy of Brabant, had been deserted by the court, but acquired a new prominence in the Low Countries thanks to its prestigious university. The Franciscans, Dominicans, and the Augustinian Hermits, who had been present in Louvain since the thirteenth century, developed close relations with the new faculty of theology in 1447 and from then on their monasteries became the intellectual centres of their orders in the Low Countries. A friary of Carmelites, the fourth mendicant order, was founded at Louvain in 1487.

The only medieval remains of the four friaries are the church, the sacristy and a part of the dormitory of the Dominicans. Not only most buildings and furniture, but also the famous libraries of the *studia* and the archives were lost when the friaries were suppressed in 1796. This essay is based on the topography, the scarce visual and historical sources, and the limited literature.[2]

Foundation and location of the mendicant friaries in the capital of Brabant

Louvain was the capital of the Duchy of Brabant until the end of the thirteenth century, when Duke John I decided to move his court to Brussels. Louvain was thus a crucial place for mendicant friars who wanted to develop their apostolate in the wealthy duchy. It is generally accepted that both the Dominicans and the Franciscans arrived from Cologne in 1228 and the Augustinian Friars around 1236. The three communities succeeded in building convents on grounds along the river Dyle, within the first ring of the city walls (Fig. 1).

Duke Henri I had allowed the Dominicans to use the chapel of the old *castrum* of the counts of Louvain, which was located on a marshy island in the middle of the city.[3] At the same time, he was building a new castle on a hill outside Louvain. After having used both residences for a couple of decades, the court moved to the new castle and Duke Henri III gave the buildings of the old court to the Dominicans in 1256. Thanks to complementary donations in 1266 and 1305, the friars expanded their

[1] I am very grateful for their support to Anna Bergmans, Caroline Bruzelius, Véronique Cardon, Maria Kelly, Aart Mekking, Zoë Opačić, Jan Roegiers, Achim Timmermann and Achim Todenhöfer.

[2] Due to the lack of written and material sources, the literature is very limited. Most authors copied the information from seventeenth-century works based on archives that had been destroyed: Bernardus de Jonghe, *Belgium dominicanum sive historia Germaniae Inferioris sacri ordinis ff. praedicatorum…*, Brussels, 1719; Antonius Sanderus, *Chorographia sacrae Brabantiae…*, The Hague, 1726; *Le Grand Théâtre sacré du Duché de Brabant…*, The Hague, 1729; Nicolaus de Tombeur, *Annales conventus Lovaniensis*, unpublished manuscript, circa 1700 (Ghent, Augustijn, Archief). A first compilation was done in the standard historical work on Louvain: Edward Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé et dans le présent*, Louvain, 1895, p. 412-422, p. 471-478 and p. 486-487. New research has been presented at a colloquium organized by the Faculty of Theology on 7-8 November 2008: "De Universiteit van Leuven en de reguliere clerus: kloostercolleges en geïncorporeerde kloosters aan de Oude Universiteit".

[3] Joseph Cuvelier, *La formation de la ville de Louvain des origines à la fin du XIVe siècle* (Académie royale de Belgique, Mémoire de la Classe des lettres, 2.10.2), Brussels, 1935.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100142

Fig. 1. Map of Louvain in the fifteenth century: **A**. First city wall (1156-1161), **B**. Second city wall (1357-1363), **C**. Island and location of the *curtis* of the counts of Louvain, **D**. New *castrum* of the dukes of Brabant, **E**. Town Hall, **F**. University (former Cloth Hall), **G**. Old Market. Main churches: 1. Collegiate church of St Peter, 2. Parish church of St Michael, 3. Parish church of St Quentin, 4. Parish church of St John, 5. Benedictine Abbey of Vlierbeek, 6. Norbertine Abbey of Park at Heverlee, 7. Regular canons and parish church of St Gertrude, 8. Franciscan Friary, 9. Dominican Friary, 10. Augustinian Hermits Friary, 11. Carmelite Friary, 12. Great Beguinage, 13. Small Beguinage, 14. Charterhouse (reconstruction Thomas Coomans 2002)

Fig. 2. Plan of the Dominican (above) and Franciscan (under) friaries at both sides of an arm of the river Dyle (reconstruction Thomas Coomans 2009, after etchings of 1664 and 1715, and cadastre of 1813)

property to a large part of the island.[4] Surrounded by water on three sides, the friary was accessible from a small street on the northern side – the Street of the Friars Preacher (Predikherenstraat) – which opened into the Brussels Street, one of the city's main axes between the market place and a city gate. The Franciscans settled on the other side of the river, facing the ducal island. It is not known why they settled there, who gave them the grounds and how they succeeded in acquiring a large plot of land close to the city wall.[5] Their convent was located along a street – the Street of the Friars Minor (Minderbroedersstraat) – leading to another city gate. The Augustinian Friars received from the city the chapel of St John the Baptist in the Fish Market and expanded their property from a corner of the market and the Street of the Augustinians (Augustijnenstraat), along the river on the west, and to the city wall on the north side.[6] The eastern side of the property was delimited by a street leading to a city gate – the Canal Street (Vaartstraat).

[4] Frans Spaey, *Het Godshuis der predikheren binnen Leuven*, Louvain, 1961, p. 49-60.

[5] Maurits Sabbe (ed.), *De Minderbroeders in de Oude Leuvense Universiteit* (Documenta Libraria, 10), Louvain, 1989; Jozef Baetens, "Minderbroederskloosters in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden. Kloosterlexicon: 44. Leuven", in *Franciscana. Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Minderbroeders in de Nederlanden*, 42, 1987, p. 81-137.

[6] F.A. Lefever, "Daar waar de Augustijnen woonden", in *Jaarboek van de Geschied- en Oudheidkundige Kring van Leuven en omgeving*, 24, 1984, p. 97-132; Michel Oosterbosch, Ernest Persoons, Jan Staes, Norbertus Teeuwen & Raymond Van Uytven, *Kaartboek van de Leuvense Augustijnen-Eremiten 1777 (Gent, Augustijnen, Archief, 2.17)*, Brussels, 2002, p. 8-16.

The three locations were excellent because they were within the twelfth-century city wall and close to a main street leading to one of the six city gates. A donation by a prince of the site of an old *castrum* in the heart of a city was not frequent and therefore all the more prestigious.[7] Even more uncommon is that three communities of mendicants succeeded in founding a friary within the same city. Generally, if one succeeded, the others settled outside the city wall and were only incorporated later when the circuit of walls was expanded.[8] The reason for the exceptional situation in Louvain could be that the plots were still available because of their marshy quality due to the regular flooding of the river; no friary, for example, was located on the higher grounds of the eastern part of the city.

A third uncommon feature was the close proximity of the Franciscan and Dominican friaries which were separated only by a narrow arm of the river (Fig. 2). At the time of their settlement, the legislation about the distance between friaries did not yet exist. In order to avoid competition between friaries in the same quarter of a town, Pope Clement IV's bull *Quia plerumque* of 28 June 1268, fixed a minimal distance of about 570 meters between two mendicant churches.[9] Nevertheless, a separation by a river signified that the convents belonged to different quarters. In Louvain, the churches were built in the most opposite corners of each friary's grounds – the Dominican church north of its cloister and the Franciscan south of its cloister, and the portals, in each case at the end of an aisle, opened in the direction of different quarters.

Three thirteen-century mendicant churches

The only surviving medieval building is the Dominican Church of Our Lady, presently used by the city of Louvain for exhibitions, concerts and other cultural activities. The church was constructed in two parts, in corresponding building campaigns: a splendid Gothic choir of four aisled bays ending in an apse which forms seven sides of a dodecagon, and a lower nave of four aisled bays closed with a flat west facade (Fig. 3). Recent research was able to date the building chronology precisely, thanks to tree-ring analysis of the roof structure and to a detailed study of the use of the splendid choir as a ducal burial place.[10] The construction of the choir started shortly before 1251 and the timber of the roof is dated 1261 and 1265. When Duke Henri III died unexpectedly on 21 February 1261, he was buried on the north side of the choir, which was still under construction. His wife Adelaide (known also as Alix or Aleydis) of Burgundy, who fervently supported the Dominicans, had founded a nunnery near Brussels and knew Thomas Aquinas personally, encouraged the continuation of the work. Two years after her death on 23 October 1273 and her burial in the church, the choir was consecrated by

[7] Three other cases are known in the Low Countries: the Dominicans at the court of the counts of Holland at Haarlem, and of the counts of Flanders at Ypres; the Franciscans near the moat of the counts of Hainaut at Valenciennes. Other examples: the Dominicans on the site of the castle of the kings of France at Évreux, the Franciscans on the site of the counts of Champagne at Troyes and the kings of France at Laon.

[8] Panayota Volti, *Les couvents des ordres mendiants et leur environnement à la fin du Moyen Âge. Le nord de la France et les anciens Pays-Bas méridionaux*, Paris, 2003, p. 187-216.

[9] (…) *infra spatium trecentarum cannarum a vestris ecclesiis mensurandarum per aera etiam ubi alias recte non permitteret loci dispositio mensurari* (…). Quoted and interpreted in: Jacques Le Goff, "Ordres mendiants et urbanisation dans la France médiévale", in *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 25/4, 1970, p. 924-946, here p. 932. One *canna* measured about 1.90 metres.

[10] Thomas Coomans & Anna Bergmans, "L'église Notre-Dame des Dominicains à Louvain (1251-1276). Le mémorial d'Henri III, duc de Brabant et d'Alix de Bourgogne", in *Bulletin monumental*, 167, 2, 2009, p. 99-125; Thomas Coomans & Anna Bergmans, "Van hertogelijke grafkerk tot *studium generale*: de Onze-Lieve-Vrouw-ter-Predikherenkerk in Leuven", in *M&L. Monumenten, landschappen en archeologie*, 24/5, September 2005, p. 6-34; Thomas Coomans, "De oudste dakconstructie in de Leuvense binnenstad: bouwhistorisch onderzoek in de predikherenkerk (prov. Vlaams-Brabant)", in *Relicta. Heritage Research in Flanders*, 1, 2006, p. 183-212.

Fig. 3. Church eastern range and site of the cloister of the Dominican Friary of Louvain, view from the south (Thomas Coomans 2007)

Albertus Magnus, the provincial of the Dominicans. A part of the ducal tomb with recumbent figures is preserved, while some lost medieval wall paintings and stained glass windows are known thanks to old drawings.[11] On the one hand, the tomb shows the prestigious connections of the dynasty of Brabant with the royal and imperial dynasties of Bohemia, Sicily, Thuringia, Swabia and Byzantium. On the other hand, the stained glass windows show the double alliance of the houses of Brabant and France: two children of Henri III and Adelaide had married two children of Louis IX and Margaret of Provence, and one of them, Mary of Brabant, became queen of France.

Like several other Dominican and Franciscan churches, the general outline of the Dominican choir of Louvain, its style and the form of its apse referred to the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris, but the presence of a ducal memorial with royal French connections gave a unique significance to the building. Having given the site of the historic *castrum* to the Dominicans, Duke Henri III decided to remain

[11] Anna Bergmans, "*Fundatio et memoria*. Verdwenen gedenktekens van de Brabantse hertogen in de Leuvense predikherenkerk (13de eeuw) (prov. Vlaams-Brabant)", in *Relicta. Heritage Research in Flanders*, 1, 2006, p. 213-236; Anna Bergmans, "Le mémorial dynastique du duc Henri III de Brabant et d'Alix de Bourgogne dans l'église des dominicains à Louvain", in *12e Congrès international d'études sur les Danses macabres et l'art macabre en général, Gand du 21 au 24 septembre 2005. Actes*, vol. 2, Meslay-le-Grenet, 2005, p. 13-30; Anne McGee Morganstern, *Gothic Tombs of Kinship in France, the Low Countries, and England*, Pennsylvania, 2000, p. 32-41.

"for eternity" on the site by being buried in his memorial church – a splendid example of a *do ut des* relation between a prince and friars. The next generations of dukes moved to Brussels and the Dominicans completed their church at the beginning of the fourteenth century on a more modest scale. The four western bays of the nave are covered with a wooden barrel vault, have a short and narrow clerestory and no flying buttresses (Fig. 3). The most impressive component is the large central window of the western façade with a refined Gothic tracery. Like several other mendicant churches, that of the Dominicans of Louvain looks incomplete, but the pointed distinction between the choir of the friars and the nave used for preaching was imposed by building legislation.[12]

The Franciscans started to build a church soon after their translation to the site in 1231, and a consecration is mentioned already in 1233.[13] Maybe only a modest choir was built in such a short time. City archives mention repair work after a heavy storm in 1343 and the gift of stained glass windows for the choir in 1355-1356.[14] The main transformation, as we shall see, was the building of a new choir in the years 1534-1536. The visual sources emphasize this new choir and the contrast of scale with the old nave (Fig. 7).[15]

The nave was of the basilican type with a central vessel flanked by aisles, four bays long, and terminating at the west with a flat façade. The windows of the clerestory are reduced and there are no buttresses, suggesting that the nave was covered with a wooden barrel vault, like the nave of the Dominicans and the Beguinage church at Louvain, both from the early fourteenth century. Nevertheless, this basilical nave could well have been built during the second half of thirteenth century, but there is little chance that it already existed in 1233. The engraving of 1664 shows a small perpendicular structure on the south side of the church, at the junction of the new choir and the old nave (Fig. 7). This could be either the south arm of a transept or a lateral chapel added at an unknown date by a lay confraternity. Although the latter hypothesis is the most credible, the presence of a transept is not totally impossible since it is known that some early Franciscan churches, influenced by Cistercian models or by the layout of Assisi, had a transept.[16] Despite the total lack of information about the first choir of the Franciscans it is certain that until the construction of the new choir in 1534-1536, the Franciscan church had a very different silhouette than the neighboring Dominican church. The choir of the Franciscans, built in the 1230s, must have conformed much more closely to the ideal of apostolic poverty than the

[12] G. Meersseman, "L'architecture dominicaine au XIIIe siècle. Législation et pratique", in *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum*, 16, 1946, p. 136-190; Volti, *Les couvents des ordres mendiants*, p. 13-21; Achim Todenhöfer, "Apostolisches Ideal im sozialen Kontext. Zum Genese der Bettelordensarchitektur im 13. Jahrhundert", in *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 34, 2008, p. 43-75.

[13] Sebald Van Ruysevelt, "De Franciskaanse kerken, de stichtingen van de dertiende eeuw: 9. Leuven", in *Franciscana. Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Minderbroeders in de Nederlanden*, 27, 1972, p. 107-121 (the date is mentioned on p. 111, but without source).

[14] *Ibidem*, p. 111.

[15] The church figures on : 1. the oldest view of Louvain, woodcut by Anton Woensam of about 1540 (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, Cab. Est. S.I-23.172) ; 2. a drawing of an album of Louvain, anonymous, seventeenth century (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, II-2123, f. 47; facsimile : Evert Cockx & Gilbert Huybens (ed.), *De Leuvense prentenatlas. Zeventiende-eeuwse tekeningen uit de Koninklijke Bibliotheek te Brussel. Deel 1 : Prentenatlas* (Jaarboek van de Geschied- en Oudheidkundige Kring voor Leuven en Omgeving, 41), Louvain, 2003, p. 83) ; 3. the anonymous etching from 1664, first published in Antonius Sanderus, *Chorographia sacra Brabantiae*, The Hague, 1726 ; 4. a drawing made after the destruction, by H. Otto and L. Van Peteghem (Leuven Museum M, Print Collection, LP/486, published in Eduard Van Even, *Louvain monumental*, Louvain, 1860).

[16] Wolfgang Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden. Die Baukunst der Dominikaner und Franziskaner in Europa*, Darmstadt, 2000, p. 37-43 and 56-64; Todenhöfer, "Apostolisches Ideal im sozialen Kontext", p. 43-75; Thomas Coomans, "Assisi and Cologne on the Banks of the Meuse: The Two Mediaeval Churches of the Franciscans at Maastricht", in *Kunst & Region. Architektur und Kunst im Mittelalter. Beiträge einer Forschungsgruppe / Art & Region. Architecture and Art in the Middle Ages. Contributions of a Research Group* (Clavis Kunsthistorische Monografieën, 20), ed. Ute M. Bräuer, Emanuel S. Klinkenberg & Jeroen Westerman, Utrecht, 2005, p. 96-116.

choir of the Dominicans. Built in the 1260s, this Dominican choir had a prestigious burial function, it demonstrated a direct knowledge of the Sainte-Chapelle, and is considered as the first church to have been built in the Gothic style in Louvain.

Thanks to indulgences accorded by Pope Clement IV in 1265, the Augustinian Friars started to build a church to replace their first chapel. The choir may already have been completed in 1270 because in that year the main altar was consecrated.[17] This means that the building of the choirs of the Dominican and Augustinian churches was contemporaneous. Nothing else is known about this church except that maintenance work is mentioned in 1404 and 1525.[18] More important is the presence in the church of a precious relic of a miraculous host, known as the Sacrament of the Miracle, which had been received from the Augustinian Hermits of Cologne in 1380 and would enhance the role of the Augustinian Friars in Louvain. The relic was the object of a Eucharistic devotion promoted by a prestigious lay confraternity founded in 1426, supported by indulgences accorded by Pope Eugenius IV in 1431, and, from 1433, by a very important annual procession through the city.[19] It is not by chance that this cult developed at the same time that the faculty of theology of the university was founded (in 1432), with, as we shall see later, an Augustinian Friar as the first holder of the chair.

Fig. 4. Church of the Augustinian Hermits of Louvain, view from the Fish Market, anonymous drawing of the seventeenth or eighteenth century (Leuven Museum M, LP.261)

Three drawings and the general plan made for the sale of the buildings after the suppression are the only sources we have for this building.[20] The church had a high Gothic nave of nine bays, and was flanked by only one aisle, at the south side opposite the cloister. At the east, the choir ended with a polygonal apse. The west end of the nave faced the river and the Fish Market; it was flat, had a large Gothic window with tracery and a round stair tower at the south-west corner. The portal of the church was located in the first western bay of the aisle. One drawing from the seventeenth century gives a view from the south-west with some precious details, which suggest two building phases (Fig. 4). The six eastern bays of the clerestory are round-arched and are separated by shafts supporting mural arches, while the three western bays have pointed windows and no mural arches. The six eastern bays of the

[17] Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé*, p. 475-476.

[18] *Ibidem*, p. 476 (without precise reference of sources).

[19] The miracle happened in 1374 at Middelburg (Zeeland), when a disrespectful domestic went to communion and the host was transformed into a piece of bleeding flesh. This relic was first preserved in Cologne Cathedral, then given to the Augustinian Friars of Cologne and, after a miraculous division into two, one half was given to the friars of Louvain. Today, the relic is preserved in the parish church of St John at Louvain. Joseph Wils, *Le Sacrement de Miracle de Louvain (1474-1905). Monographie d'histoire religieuse*, Louvain, 1905, p. 11-21.

[20] The church figures on: 1. a drawing of an album of Louvain, anonymous, seventeenth century (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, II-2123, f. 52, facsimile : Cockx & Huybens, *De Leuvense prentenatlas*, p. 90) ; 2. an anonymous drawing (Leuven Museum M, Print Collection, LP.261) ; 3. a plan made for the sale of the buildings in 1797 (Brussels, Archives générales du Royaume, Affiches des biens nationaux, 37) ; 4. a lithograph made after the destruction, by A. Joos (Leuven Museum M, Print Collection, LP.263; see Fig. 6). Reproduced in: Lefever, "Daar waar de Augustijnen woonden", p. 97-132; Oosterbosch et al, *Kaartboek van de Leuvense Augustijnen*, p. 8-27.

aisle are a little larger than the bays further west. These differences suggest that the eastern bays of the nave could belong to the first building phase and are not in contradiction with the dating of 1265-1270. The western bays and the façade with the Gothic tracery window are similar to the west façade of the Dominican church and the east façade of the Beguinage church, both from the early fourteenth century. The absence of buttresses at the clerestorey and the height of the window in relation to the gable of the west facade suggest that the nave was covered by a wooden barrel vault, as it was at the Dominicans, the Beguinage and the Franciscans.

Except for the choir of the Dominicans, the churches of the Augustinian Friars and the Franciscans, as well as the nave of the Dominicans belonged to the typical mendicant architecture of the thirteenth century that expressed the ideals of apostolic poverty. They had no towers, no stone vaulting, no transepts (except, perhaps, for the Franciscan church), no architectonic decoration or rich ornaments, and only flat west facades.[21] Furthermore, the fact that they were the products of a local architectural context also explains their similarities.[22] The identity of these three churches was certainly recognizable in the skyline of medieval Louvain: their long saddleback roofs, punctuated only by a small spire, differed radically from the collegiate church of St Peter and the other parish churches with their towers and transepts.

The influence of the new university and the reformation of the friaries

The university of Louvain was founded in 1425 by Pope Martin V at the request of the city and the chapter of Louvain, and would quickly become an important intellectual centre between Cologne and Paris.[23] In the fifteenth century the Burgundian Low Countries reached their cultural peak and Louvain gained a new prestige thanks to its university. As in the other merchant towns of Brabant, Flanders, Holland and Zeeland, the main parish churches were rebuilt and a remarkable Late Gothic town hall (1448-1468) expressed the ambitions of the city. The Franciscans, Dominicans and Augustinian Friars turned their *studia* into a *studia generale* or *studia theologium* and developed strong relations with the *Sacra Facultas Theologica*, which was founded by Pope Eugenius IV in 1432.[24] The first professor of theology was an Augustinian friar.[25] In 1447 the three mendicant *studia generale* were incorporated into the university, as had happened in Paris and Cologne. The Carmelites, the fourth mendicant order, who were present in other cities of Brabant from the thirteenth century, arrived at Louvain in 1431, and their *studium* was incorporated in the university in 1461.[26]

[21] For the Low Countries, see: Thomas Coomans, "L'architecture médiévale des ordres mendiants (Franciscains, Dominicains, Carmes et Augustins) en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas", in *Revue belge d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art*, 70, 2001, p. 3-111.

[22] Thomas Coomans, "Les églises des Dominicains et du Grand Béguinage à Louvain: comparaisons typologiques", in *'Mulieres religiosæ' et leur univers. Aspects des établissements béguinaux au Moyen Âge tardif* (Histoire Médiévale et Archéologie, 15), ed. Panayota Volti, Lille & Amiens, 2003, p. 25-41.

[23] On the history of the university, see: Emiel Lambrechts & Jan Roegiers (ed.), *Leuven University 1425-1985*, 2nd ed., Louvain, 1990.

[24] Henri De Jongh, *L'ancienne faculté de théologie de Louvain au premier siècle de son existence (1432-1540): ses débuts, son organisation, son enseignement, sa lutte contre Erasme et Luther*, Louvain, 1911, p. 47-49; Edmond Reusens, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire de l'Université de Louvain (1425-1797)*, vol. 5/3: *Collèges et pédagogies*, Louvain, 1889-1892, p. 182-227 (including lists with the names of the mendicant professors).

[25] *Le Grand Théâtre sacré du Brabant…*, vol. 1, The Hague, 1734, p. 117.

[26] Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé*, p. 486-487. Also discussed at the recent colloquium (see above note 2).

[27] Valerius Andreas, *Fasti Academici studii generalis Lovaniensis…*, Louvain, 1650, p. 29-35.

Each friary kept its own *studium* and awarded its own diplomas, but the mendicant students were registered at the university, had the same rights as other students, and were obliged to follow some courses at the faculty. So, for example, in the *studium* of the Dominicans, both classes of philosophy and theology had two professors called *lectores* and *regentes*, and later also a *magister studii*, who gave courses in the friary (*intra parietes domesticos*), but there was always a Dominican on the staff of the faculty of theology (*regens strictae facultatis*). Their relations with the university were so close that until 1635 the tradition was to hold the elections of rectors and other important meetings at the Dominican house.[27]

The dynamism of the *studia* attracted lay students and thus lay confraternities were formed from the 1470s.[28] From the beginning of the sixteenth century, Louvain became an important centre for the printing of catechetical, devotional, mystical and theological books, many of which were written by friars.[29] The publications of Franciscus Tittelmans, a Franciscan theologian, which took issue with the exegetical works of Desiderius Erasmus, caused a famous controversy in the years 1527-1530. The other mendicant orders also provided brilliant professors for the university.

The situation of the mendicant communities at Louvain has to be placed in the broader context of the reform of religious orders in the Low Countries, which was encouraged by the dukes of Burgundy. In 1465 reformed convents of Dominicans formed the autonomous *Congregatio Hollandiae*, which the friary of Louvain would join in 1494.[30] In 1515 the Dominican convents of the Low Countries formed a new province within the order, the *Provincia Germania inferioris*, in which the *studium theologicum* of Louvain had a central position. A first provincial chapter was held at Louvain in 1524. The Franciscan community of Louvain belonged to the branch of the Conventuals, but joined the Coletan Reform Movement in 1499, before turning to the Observants in 1506.[31] In the *Provincia Germanica*, Louvain became the centre of the observance, that is to say of a monastic life conducted in conformity with the austerity and poverty of St Francis, and it attracted renowned Franciscan theologians. Many students, professors and even two chancellors of the university became Franciscans. The Carmelite house of Louvain became the *studium generale* of the Carmelite province of *Germania inferioris* in 1503.[32] It was located not far from the Brussels gate of the late fourteenth-century second city wall (Fig. 1).[33] The Augustinian friary of Louvain became the *studium* of the Belgian province only in 1589 during the Counter-Reformation.[34]

These inner reforms of the convents and their key role in the faculty of theology at the university would have crucial consequences during the Protestant Reformation and the subsequent religious wars in the Low Countries. The University of Louvain was the guardian of Roman Catholic orthodoxy – Adrian of Utrecht had been a professor of theology at Louvain before becoming pope under the name of Adrian VI (1522-1523) – and in their *studia* the friars were trained to preach against heretics. This explains why most mendicant friaries, in particular the Franciscans, were sacked by the iconoclasts in 1566 and why dozens of Franciscans were martyred by the Calvinists.[35]

[28] Dominicans: confraternities of the Rosary (1474), the Holy Name of Jesus (1474) and the Holy Trinity (1478). A confraternity of the Sacrament of the Miracle was already in existence at the Augustinians since 1426.

[29] Sabbe, *De Minderbroeders*, p. 38-55.

[30] A. De Meyer, *La Congrégation de Hollande ou la réforme dominicaine en territoire bourguignon, 1465-1515*, Liège, 1946.

[31] Baetens, *Kloosterlexicon*, p. 81-137.

[32] François De Ridder, "Het studiehuis der Karmelieten te Leuven", in *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis. Bijzonder van het aloude Hertogdom Brabant*, 6, 1907, p. 417-431.

[33] In 1489, a Charterhouse was founded in the same area of the city. It would be incorporated in the university in 1521.

[34] Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé*, p. 476.

[35] Among them six Franciscan friars from Louvain. Four of the martyrs of Gorcum (1572) had been educated in Louvain, see Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé*, p. 472.

Buildings and organization of the *studia generale*

"Even the stones themselves of the convent of Louvain are holy, and I don't know what perfume of virtue they exhale", wrote a minister-general of the Franciscans in 1587.[36] Unfortunately, hardly anything is known about the medieval buildings of the mendicant *studia* of Louvain, except that the mendicants sometimes asked the university for financial intervention for the maintenance of their buildings, arguing that the university regularly used rooms in their convents and that the presence of their *studia* honoured the university.[37] The rare views from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are the only sources, but it is impossible to ascertain precisely which buildings date from the Middle Ages.

The view of the Dominican convent, dated 1715, shows it from the west (Fig. 5).[38] The cloister was on the south side of the church and the east wing, with the sacristy and the chapter house, was reserved for the community. The caption on the engraving notes that the dormitory of the philosophy students was above the north wing of the cloister and that of the theology students above the south and west wings. The *studium* building formed the west range facing the west garden. A court occupied the southern area of the complex, between the river and the refectory. Around that court were the house of the prior, the guesthouse, the chambers of the *moderatores* and *lectores* of the *studium,* the kitchen and other service buildings such as a brewery and a linen room. The library was on the first floor of a building located along the river, perpendicular to the south-east corner of the east range. Further to the east, around the east garden, were the infirmary, the pharmacy, and the house of the Dominican member of the staff of the faculty of theology. The main entrance to the complex was the gatehouse at the north-east side.

As a consequence of floods, the Augustinian Friars rebuilt their cloister in the years 1509-1515 at a higher level, but still on the north side of the church.[39] Elements of the west wing survive in houses built along the street after the suppression. A nineteenth-century drawing, based on a lost drawing dating from before 1612, gives a view of the whole complex from the east (Fig. 6). The *studium* was located in the extension of the refectory, which occupied the north range of the cloister. A large garden extended from that range as far as the city wall. Unidentified buildings closed off the garden both on the east and west sides. In 1612, a new *collegium* was built in Baroque style along the Canal Street (Vaartstraat).

The engraving of the Franciscan convent dated 1664 is a perspective view from the north-east, emphasizing the Gothic choir of the church, two square cloisters north of the church, the long lateral street (Minderbroedersstraat) leading to a gate in the first city wall, and the big urban garden divided in two by the river (Fig. 7). According to the identifications mentioned in the caption, the west cloister was the oldest one: the east wing housed the chapter house and the dormitory above; in the west wing was the refectory and another dormitory overhead; the north wing alongside the river and facing the Dominicans consisted only of a cloister walk with some rooms overhead; the library occupied the first floor of the south wing, along the church. The east cloister is called *Schola S. Theologiae*, but the building on the street side carries the date 1612. At the north side of the garden four buildings are aligned

[36] *Lapides conventus Lovaniensis sanci sunt, & nescio quam sanctitatem redolent…*, Franciscus Gonzaga, *De origine Seraphicae Religionis Franciscanae…*, Rome, 1587, p. 991-997.

[37] In 1511-1515, the Augustinian Friars asked for funds for the restoration of their refectory and a new stained glass window; in 1514, the Carmelites for the building of their *collegium*, see H. De Jongh, *L'ancienne faculté de théologie de Louvain au premier siècle de son existence (1432-1540): ses débuts, son organisation, son enseignement, sa lutte contre Erasme et Luther*, Louvain, 1911, p. 48, for documents see, p. 7.

[38] Thomas Coomans & Dirk Van Eenhooge, "De 13de-eeuwse oostvleugel van het predikherenklooster te Leuven", in *M&L. Monumenten, landschappen en archeologie*, 24/5, September 2005, p. 35-50.

[39] Lefever, "Daar waar de Augustijnen woonden", p. 99; Oosterbosch et al, *Kaartboek*, p. 10-16.

Fig. 5. Dominican Friary of Louvain, perspective view from the west, etching of Jacques Harrewijn after a drawing by Bernardus de Jonghe, 1715. Published in: Bernardus de Jonghe, *Belgium dominicanum* […], Brussels, 1719 (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Maurits Sabbe Library)

Fig. 6. Friary of the Augustinian Hermits of Louvain, perspective view from the east, lithograph of A. Joos after an unknown older drawing, mid-nineteenth century. Published in Eduard Van Even, *Louvain monumental*, Louvain, 1860 (Leuven Museum M LP.263)

Fig. 7. Franciscan Friary of Louvain, perspective view from the east, anonymous etching of 1664. First published in Antonius Sanderus, *Chorographia sacra Brabantiae*, vol. 2, The Hague, 1726 (Brussels, Flemish Institute for Heritage)

along the river, with their south facades turned towards the garden: the first, perpendicular to the refectory of the friars, was the kitchen, followed by a guesthouse, the infirmary and another guesthouse. A second garden, connected by a bridge, reached the city wall. A hermitage or a chapel was situated in one corner next to an old tower, while an infirmary with rooms for contagious patients was located along the river.

The main architectural change was, without doubt, the construction of the new choir of the Franciscan church with a small *Porziuncola* chapel behind the apse. The first stone was laid on the 1st of July 1533 and the choir was consecrated with great pomp on 15 July 1536.[40] This choir, five bays long, ended in a pentagonal apse, and opened up with lancet windows which extended the full height of each bay. This was the ultimate type of Late Gothic monastic choir. Other examples are preserved or documented in the Low Countries, the most famous undoubtedly being the choir of the Dominican church (St Paul) in Antwerp, which was begun in 1517.[41]

[40] Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé*, p. 472; Van Ruysevelt, "De Franciscaanse kerken", p. 114-118.

An architectural competition

With the construction of their new choir, the Franciscans gave to their church an elevation that was comparable with that of the Dominicans: a high and elegant Gothic choir contrasting with a lower nave. In the Dominicans' church the choir was older than the nave, while in that of the Franciscans the nave was older than the choir. If the Dominican choir belonged to the first generation of choirs influenced by the Sainte-Chapelle, that of the Franciscans, built two and a half centuries later, belonged to the last. The Franciscans finally equaled the level of the Dominicans in a fascinating visual tension between two neighbouring churches. Furthermore, the new choir certainly expressed the status of the community of Louvain within the Franciscan order, as the new theological centre of the Observants of the *Provincia Germanica*.

The choirs of mendicant churches were not only places for daily Eucharist and monastic liturgy. Mendicant churches also were places for burial and the most important burials were located in the sacred space of the choirs.[42] The prestige of the ducal tomb at the Dominicans, or of the relic of the Sacrament of the Miracle at the Augustinian Friars, could only be equaled by the Franciscans with burials of saints and renowned theologians. They were very proud to bury in their choir the blessed Thierry of Münster, who died in Louvain in 1515.[43] Another famous man who had been buried at the Franciscans, in 1475, was the painter Thierry Bouts.[44] To add to that prestige, in 1536, the Augustinian Friars buried in their choir a friar who had been the confessor of the queen of France.[45] Similar competitions between mendicants are known in many other cities and the architectural consequences of it have been demonstrated, for example in Cologne in relation to the burials of St Albert Magnus and St John Duns Scotus.[46]

There is only a small amount of information about the medieval altars and other furnishings. Before deciding to build the new choir, the Franciscans had furnished their church with a new rood screen in 1464 and new stalls in 1523.[47] The Dominicans also placed new Late Gothic stalls in their choir around 1530, which are partially preserved.[48] A remarkable early Renaissance retable representing the Virgin and the Child, attributed to Jan Gossaert, and now preserved in the Prado in Madrid, comes from an altar of the Augustinian church. We have seen that the ducal chapel and the choir of the Dominicans had a series of prestigious stained glass windows from the late thirteenth century, one of them given by Mary of Brabant, queen of France. The windows of the Franciscans' new choir depicted a series of scenes from the Passion of Christ.

[41] Coomans, "L'architecture médiévale des ordres mendiants", p. 3-111.

[42] Caroline Bruzelius, "The Dead Come to Town: Preaching, Burying, and Building in the Mendicant Order", in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture* (Architectura Medii Aevi, 1), ed. Alexandra Gajewski & Zoë Opačić, Turnhout, 2007, p. 203-224.

[43] Diederik Coelde van Münster (circa 1435-1515), the first Observant guardian of Louvain, author of popular and catechetical works. See: Sabbe, *De Minderbroeders*, p. 43-44.

[44] Burials in the four mendicant churches of Louvain are described in: *Le Grand Théâtre sacré du Duché de Brabant…*, vol. 1, The Hague, 1734, p. 112-119.

[45] *Ibidem*, p. 117: Jean Sceirberg, former prior of the convent of Louvain, had been the confessor of Eleanor of Austria, a sister of Emperor Charles V, and the second wife of François I, king of France.

[46] Wolfgang Schenkluhn, *Ordines studentes. Aspekte zur Kirchenarchitektur der Dominikaner und Franziskaner im 13. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1985, p. 204-230.

[47] Van Ruysevelt, "De Franciscaanse kerken", p. 111-112.

[48] They were made by a lay brother, Godfried van der Loy, who decorated the misericords with scenes from the Old Testament. For the iconography, see: J.A. Van Spaandonk, "Een beeldhouwer op de vingers gekeken: grafische voorbeelden voor de zittertjes van het koorgestoelte in de Leuvense kerk van Onze-Lieve-Vrouw-ter-Predikheren", in *Acta Lovaniensis artes atque historiae reserans documenta. Jaarboek*, 15-16, 1986-1987, p. 145-221.

During the Counter-Reformation, the faculty of theology of Louvain continued to play a central role in the Southern Netherlands and new orders founded houses in the university city. The most serious competitors of the mendicants were the Jesuits who had already arrived in Louvain in 1547 and in the seventeenth century built a great Baroque church with a triumphant façade on the town's highest point. However, they never succeeded in gaining permanent positions on the staff of the faculty of theology and the churches of the mendicants remained the burial places for the illustrious professors of the university. One of the most famous, the humanist Justus Lipsius, was buried in 1606 at the Franciscans.[49] In a book on Louvain, he describes the several religious houses of the city and insisted on the primacy of the Dominicans, followed by the Franciscans: "The first were the Dominicans who also were the first of the religious orders from a chronological point of view. (…) The same duke built there a church and other buildings, which still are existing from this time (remarkably enough), the original stained glass windows in the choir, which he himself and his children have given. (…) Franciscans are close to their backyard, only separated by an arm of the river. (…) Their convent is old: the choir of the church is new, high and magnificent …".[50]

[49] Van Even, *Louvain dans le passé*, p. 473-474.

[50] *Dominicani qui & tempore sunt inter religiosos hic primi. (…) Ille idem Princeps templum, & alia, ibi struxit: extantque ab illo aevo (satis notabile) ipsae fenestrae vitreae in choro, quas ille & liberi donarunt (…). Franciscani a tergo adhaerant, brachio fluminis divisi. (…) Coenobium vetus est: chorus templi novus, altus & illustris* …, Justus Lipsius, *Lovanium: sive opidi et academiae eius descriptio liber tres*, Antwerp, Jan Moretus, 1605, vol. 3, p. 84-86. For a recent reprint and Flemish translation see, Justus Lipsius, *Leuven. Beschrijving van de stad en haar universiteit. Latijnse tekst met inleiding, vertaling en aantekeningen*, ed. Jan Papy, Louvain, 2000, p. 208-213 and p. 308-309.

The Abbey Church at Vézelay and the Cult of Mary Magdalene: "invitation to a journey of discovery"[1]

Alexandra Gajewski

Today's visitor to Vézelay, having climbed the steep road that follows the crest of the hill up to the top, finds him- or herself suddenly confronted with the massive façade of the abbey church, an ensemble of triple portals and towers (the north tower remained unfinished), now heavily restored by Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879) (Fig. 1).[2] Entering through the re-carved western portal, the visitor traverses the narthex, passes through the famous twelfth-century nave portals and, at last, penetrates the nave (Fig. 2). There,

Fig. 1 Vézelay, La Madeleine, western façade (Stuart Harrison)

Abbreviations:

B.H.L. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, ed. Société des Bollandistes, 3 vols., Brussels 1898-1911.

P.L. *Patrologiae cursus completus series latina*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, 221 vols., Paris 1841-1864; 2nd ed. 1879.

[1] The quote is adapted from Paul Crossley, "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: The Limits of Iconography", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 130, 1988, p. 116-121, p. 121: "For the twelfth century symbols were to the inner, spiritual, world what pilgrimages and the knightly quest were to the outer: invitations to a journey of discovery." – My profound thanks go to Paul Crossley who has been such an inspiration as a former-supervisor, colleague and friend, as I hope this essay shows. But I cannot pick up this subject without expressing my deep gratitude to my other former PhD supervisor, Lindy Grant, who first encouraged my interest in Vézelay. It is also a pleasure to thank Susann Schlesinger and Arnaud Timbert who have generously shared their knowledge of Vézelay with me over the years. Peter Diemer very kindly allowed me to read the proofs of Peter Diemer & Dorothea Diemer, "Le grand portail de Vézelay", in *Cluny Onze Siecles de Rayonnement*, ed. Neil Stratford, Paris, 2010, p. 200-213. Finally, without Christopher Wilson's comments, Christopher Masters's reading and Zoë Opačić's patient and thoughtful editing, this paper would certainly have been the poorer.

[2] See the description of the village and the plan in Victor Petit, *Description des villes et campagnes du département de l'Yonne, Adrondissement d'Avallon* (first published 1870), Avallon 1988, p. 237-239, fig. 243. For Viollet-le-Duc's restoration see Neil Stratford & Lydwine Saulnier, *La sculpture oubliée de Vézelay: Catalogue du musée lapidaire* (Bibliothèque de la Société Française d'Archéologie, 17), Geneva, 1984; Kevin D. Murphy, *Memory and Modernity: Viollet-le-Duc at Vézelay*, University Park PA, 2000; Susann Schlesinger, "Gotische Romanik - romanische Gotik?: Viollet-le-Duc rekonstruiert den Kreuzgang in Vézelay", in *Zeiten - Sprünge: Aspekte von Raum und Zeit in der Kunst vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart; Studien zu Ehren von Peter K. Klein zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Nicole Hille & Monika E. Müller, Regensburg, 2007, p. 173-192.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100143

Fig. 2 Vézelay, La Madeleine, central portal of the nave façade (Stuart Harrison)

he or she is confronted with a striking, unimpeded vista towards the east end: the low nave bays with their rounded, bi-coloured arches, flanked by the celebrated figurative capitals, lead up to the dazzlingly radiant, light-weight eastern apse (Fig. 3). Next to the nave portals and the capitals, it is this iconic vista, gracing guide-books as much as scholarly textbooks, that perpetuates the abbey's fame.

To an extent, this view is a post-medieval creation. The loss of stained-glass and paint, the removal of screens and liturgical furnishings, and above all Viollet-le-Duc's restoration (lasting from 1840 to circa 1858) have altered our impression of the interior.[3] Perhaps Viollet-le-Duc's most serious intervention – as far as the general view to the east is concerned – was the reconstruction, starting in 1844, of three of the four thirteenth-century vaults at the east end of the Romanesque nave. In so doing, the young restorer hoped to re-establish the harmony of the eleventh-century nave.[4] The effect is to create a more pronounced contrast between the Romanesque nave and the early Gothic chevet. Nonetheless, despite these losses and interventions, there is evidence to suggest that the east end was always intended as a visual culmination of the church. Not only are the hemicycle columns and the central vessel of the chevet built from a different type of limestone, more grey and dense, than the rest of the church but also, in contrast to the ambulatory, the central vessel was never painted.[5] Moreover, as Christopher Wilson noted, the clerestorey windows are pushed well below the springing level of the vaults, a feature that was to become common only in the early thirteenth century.[6] As a result, more light enters the apse than any other part of the church, and, being reflected on the bare limestone walls, it transforms the eastern corona into a luminous denouement of the church.

Like the poet Paul Claudel (1868-1955), who left a moving, lyrical description of the view down the nave to the east end, scholars have almost universally acclaimed the aesthetic appeal of the Gothic

[3] MURPHY, *Memory and Modernity* (see note 2), p. 5, 71, argues that Viollet-le-Duc created a "bright and open space" that appeals to modern sensibilities. However, see also the review of Martin BRESSANI in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 59, 2000, p. 552-554, who emphasizes that Viollet-le-Duc's primary objective was to create a strong historical ambience.

[4] MURPHY, *Memory and Modernity* (see note 2), p. 112-113, quotes Viollet-le-Duc's letter proposing the reconstruction to the minister of the interior, p. 175 note 76: "…il est préférable de les reconstruire romanes ainsi qu'elles existaient. Cette belle nef du XIeme siècle sera donc alors complète." According to Viollet-le-Duc, another reason for rebuilding was the structural instability of these vaults.

[5] Arnaud TIMBERT, *Vézelay, Le chevet de la Madeleine et le premier gothique bourguignon* (Collection art & société), Rennes, 160-161, 165-168. Timbert suggests that the stone for the hemicycle columns came from a quarry in Thisy, rather than Coutarnoux (both arr. Avallon, Yonne), as previously suggested, and that for the upper parts of the chevet perhaps from Courson (arr. Auxerre, Yonne) and Dissangis (arr. Avallon, Yonne). The ambulatory was built with stone from Coutarnoux and near-by Tharoiseau (arr. Avallon, Yonne), while the nave was built with Tharoiseau stone.

[6] Christopher WILSON, *The Gothic Cathedral, the architecture of the great church*, 1130-1530, London, 1990, p. 96; Christopher WILSON , "Lausanne and Canterbury : a 'special relationship' re-considered", in *Die Kathedrale von Lausanne und ihr Marienportal im Kontext der europäischen Gotik*, ed. Peter KURMANN & Martin Rohde (Scrinium Friburgense, 13), Berlin, 2004, p. 89-124, here p. 107. Francis SALET, *La Madeleine de Vézelay* (Étude iconographique par Jean Adhémar), Melun, 1948, p. 72, suggests that the upper windows were never filled with coloured glass, but he provides no sources.

[7] See CLAUDEL, quoted in *Le patrimoine de la basilique de Vézelay* (Collection Le Patrimoine mondial), Charenton-le-Pont, 1999, p. 298-299 : "Aux douves recourbées pareilles aux couples d'un vaisseau aux membrages d'une forte châsse, qui soutiennent l'allée centrale, succède, et quelle blancheur éblouissante, le chœur vertical dans les plis de son aube gothique. Nulle couleur que cette émanation d'une myrrhe spirituelle dans le silence intense de la lumière." Among the scholars, see SALET, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 80-81: "Cependant le choeur gothique s'accorde à merveille avec la nef romane et lui fait un admirable couronnement."; Dieter KIMPEL & Robert SUCKALE, *Die gotische Architektur in Frankreich 1130-1270*, Munich, 1985, p. 145: "… ein Großteil seiner Wirkung bezog er (the choir) aus dem Kontrast zum alten romanischen Langhaus"; Alain ERLANDE-BRANDENBURG & Anne-Bénédicte MÉREL-BRANDENBURG, *Du Moyen Age à la Renaissance, IVe siècle - début XVIe siècle* (Histoire de l'architecture française, 1), Paris, 1995, p. 275: "… il s'agit donc d'adapter ce sanctuaire à une

Fig. 3 Vézelay, La Madeleine, nave, view to the east (Stuart Harrison)

choir's harmonious contrast with the earlier Romanesque nave.[7] However, in the early-twentieth-century tradition of architectural investigation, studies have tended to distinguish the construction campaigns of buildings such as Vézelay and thus to discuss the choir, the nave and the narthex separately as part of different periods and stylistic categories.[8] Only relatively recently, and in the context of developing more integrated approaches to architecture,[9] have scholars discussed the relationship between different parts of buildings, especially asking how churches might have functioned as a whole.[10] Among them, Paul Crossley's work has been fundamental in exploring integration within church space. In a number of seminal studies, starting with an essay on St Laurence in Nuremberg, he showed how images, sculpture and installations could be associated in the viewers' experience through movement and meaning, or ritual and performance.[11] For example, according to Crossley, Abbot Suger's well-known insistence on the "concordance and coherence" between the Carolingian nave and the new Gothic east of Saint-Denis, which determined several key aspects of the chevet's design, took on its full meaning in the liturgy of the church consecration on 11 June 1144.[12] At the same time, the extension of a building could have a profound effect on an existing structure. Michael Davis argued that the addition, in the early fourteenth century, of ambulatory chapels to the twelfth-century chevet of Notre-Dame in Paris was accompanied by a radical reorganization of the liturgical use of the choir.[13] These studies demonstrate that the fragmented view of church architecture, classified by periods of construction, does not necessarily reflect the medieval experience of the church and its associated functions. The sacred topography of the church, like a 'cognitive map', suggested pathways within the building which Crossley most recently linked to the rhetorical notion of *ductus*, a journey of the mind towards a goal.[14]

édifice préexistant. L'architecte de Vézelay, qui conçut son projet au cours des années 1185, a parfaitement réussi ce défit en réalisant un accord parfait entre les deux styles."; and, most recently, TIMBERT, *Vézelay* (see note 5), p. 11 : " …le chevet de la Madeleine se déploie avec fluidité à l'extrémité de la nef romane".

[8] See Jean-Auguste BRUTAILS, "Comment il ne faut pas rédiger une monographie d'église", in *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France*, 11, 1925, p. 157-166 (161) : "En ce qui concerne la construction, je ne vois pas pourquoi on ne suivrait pas l'ordre même dans lequel les diverses parties du monument ont été élevées." Two studies of Vézelay have considered the integration of spaces: Kristin SAZAMA, *The Assertion of Monastic Spiritual and Temporal Authority in the Romanesque Sculpture of Sainte-Madeleine at Vézelay*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1995, p. 40-41, regards the nave and the narthex portals as successive stages of entry into the church. Peter Low, "'You who were once far off': Enlivening Scripture in the Main Portal at Vézelay", in *The Art Bulletin*, 85, 2003, p. 469-489, here p. 472 discusses the western portal as a place of passage.

[9] See especially Virginia C. RAGUIN, Kathryn BRUSH & Peter DRAPER (ed.), *Artistic Integration in Gothic Buildings*, Toronto, Buffalo & London, 1995.

[10] See the discussion in Paul CROSSLEY, "Introduction", in Paul FRANKL, *Gothic Architecture*, revised by Paul CROSSLEY (Yale University Press Pelican History of Art), New Haven, 2000, p. 24-25.

[11] Paul CROSSLEY, "The Man from Inner Space: Architecture and Meditation in the Choir of St. Laurence in Nuremberg," in *Medieval Art: Recent Perspectives: a memorial tribute to C.R. Dodwell*, ed. by Gale R. OWEN-CROCKER, Manchester, 1998, p. 165-182.

[12] Paul CROSSLEY, "The integrated cathedral: thoughts on 'holism' and Gothic architecture", in *The Four Modes of Seeing. Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyn STAUDINGER LANE, Elizabeth Carson PASTAN & Ellen M. SHORTELL, Farnham, 2009, 157-173, here p. 172-173. See also Eric FERNIE, "Suger's 'Completion' of Saint-Denis", in RAGUIN, BRUSH & DRAPER, *Artistic Integration* (see note 9), p. 84-91; and Bruno KLEIN, "*Convenientia* and *cohaerentia antiqui et novi operis*: ancien et nouveau aux débuts de l'architecture gothique", in *Pierre, lumière, couleur: Études d'histoire de l'art du moyen âge en l'honneur d'Anne Prache*, ed. Fabienne JOUBERT (Cultures et civilisations médiévales, 20), Paris, 1999, 19-32.

[13] Michael T. DAVIS, "Splendor and Peril: the Cathedral of Paris, 1290-1350", in *The Art Bulletin*, 80, 1998, p. 34-66.

[14] Paul CROSSLEY, "Ductus and memoria: Chartres Cathedral and the workings of rhetoric", in *Rhetoric beyond Words: Delight and Persuasion in the Arts of the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary CARRUTHERS (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 78), Cambridge, 2010, 214-249; Crossley (*Ibidem*, p. 244 note 9) adopts the word "cognitive map" from Pamela C. GRAVES, "Social Space in the English Medieval Parish Church", in *Economy and Society*, 18, 1989, p. 297-322, here p. 303.

At Vézelay, the church with its succession of sculpted façades and architectural spaces, culminating in the choir, clearly invites such an integrated approach. Yet, the key to understanding how the building might have functioned as an aesthetic and symbolic whole lies in liturgy as Crossley defined it, "meaning, in the broadest sense, the ritual of the church's services and any other form of corporal or public worship".[15] Unfortunately, there is an almost complete lack of relevant evidence: altars and screens have been removed long ago; the library and any ordinals and processionals have disappeared, perhaps burnt in 1569 during the Wars of Religion.[16] Nonetheless, after a meticulous analysis of the liturgical and hagiographical sources, Victor Saxer has identified the "*cycle vézelien*", a collection of texts concerning Mary Magdalene that was written and assembled at Vézelay from the time of Abbot Geoffrey (1037-1052) into the twelfth century, intended for the offices and readings of 22 July, the saint's feast day. In its developed form, it included two sermons, a Life (*Vita apostolica*), a report describing how the body of Mary Magdalene was brought to Vézelay (*Translatio posterior*), and several miracles.[17] A slightly different, perhaps earlier, Life and Translation report (*Vita omnipotentis* and *Translatio prior*) were probably also written at Vézelay.[18] In addition, the *Pilgrim's Guide to Santiago de Compostela*, the fifth book of the *Liber Sancti Jacobi*, contains a passage on Vézelay. Although it is no longer generally accepted that the guide's author was Aymery Picaud from Asquins, near Vézelay, there remains a connection between Picaud and the *Guide* since he and his wife are described as the bearers of the manuscript to Compostela.[19] There is, furthermore, some post-medieval information about the location of the monastic choir. Finally, the main piece of evidence is of course the church itself with its architecture and sculpture, inviting us to measure our own visual experience against what can be ascertained about medieval reality.

The cult at Vézelay declined after the discovery, in 1279, of Mary Magdalene relics at Saint-Maximin in Provence.[20] In 1537 the abbey was secularized and subsequently damaged during the Wars of Religion. Abbot Erard de Rochefort (1601-1630) refurbished the interior with a new *jubé* situated in the crossing, choir stalls, and a high altar in the eastern apse.[21] Prior to secularization, however, the

[15] Paul Crossley, "Introduction" (see note 10), p. 29.

[16] For the lost library see Peter Diemer, *Stil und Ikonographie der Kapitelle von Ste.-Madeleine Vézelay*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Ruprecht-Karl-Universität, Heidelberg, 1975, p. 5-8. The only surviving liturgical manuscript is a fourteenth-century breviary (Lyon, Bibliothèque Municipal, MS 555). See the discussion in Victor Saxer, *Le culte de Marie Madeleine en Occident des origines à la fin du Moyen Age*, published doctoral thesis, University of Strasbourg, Auxerre-Paris, 1959, p. 306-309.

[17] Saxer, *Le culte* (see note 16), p. 153-182, 315-318, and Saxer, "Maria Maddalena, santa. – III. La leggenda", in *Bibliotheca sanctorum*, ed. Filippo Caraffa, vol. 8, Rome, 1961-1970, col. 1092-1104. The *Vita apostolica* (the term was coined by Saxer) corresponds to *B.H.L.* 5443-5449. This text, together with the *Translatio posterior* (*B.H.L.* 5491) was edited by Guy Lobrichon, "Le dossier magdalénien aux XIe-XIIe siècles. Édition de trois pièces majeures", in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen-Age, Temps modernes*, 104/1, 1992, p. 163-180. The miracles will be discussed below.

[18] *B.H.L.* 5442 and 5488. They form a single text in the only surviving copy. A discussion and edition of the text can be found in Baudouin de Gaiffier, "Hagiographie Bourguignonne", in *Analecta Bollandiana*, 69, 1951, p. 131-147.

[19] The earliest extant manuscript of the *Liber Sancti Jacobi*, also called *Codex Calixtinus*, is preserved in the Archivo de la Catedral of Santiago de Compostela. Aymery Picaud is mentioned several times in the fifth book, the *Pilgrim's Guide*, but the mention that links him to Vézelay can be found on fol. 192: *Hunc codicem* (…) *quem Pictauensis Aymericus Picaudus de Partiniaco ueteri, qui etiam Oliuerus de Isacani (Asquins), villa sancte Marie Magdalene de Uiziliaco, dicitur, et Giberga Flandrensis sotia eius, pro animarum suarum redemptione sancto Jacobo Gallecianensi dederunt.* Quoted from André Moisan, "Aimeri Picaud de Parthenay et le 'Liber sancti Jacobi'", in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 143, 1985, p. 5-58, here p. 6 note 1; and from Annie Shaver-Crandell, Paula Lieber Gerson & Alison Stones (ed.), *The pilgrim's guide to Santiago de Compostela: a gazetteer*, London, 1995, p. 60-61 note 68. See also their discussion of the authorship of the guide p. 54-56. For the guide's date see p. 25.

[20] Saxer, *Le culte* (see note 16), p. 184-227; see also the summary of events in Jonathan Sumption, *Pilgrimage: an Image of Medieval Religion*, London, 1975, p. 37-38.

[21] Nicolas-Léonard Martin, *Précis historique et anecdotes diverses sur la ville et l'ancienne abbaye de Vézelay*, Auxerre, 1832, p. 230-233; Stratford & Saulnier, *Sculpture oubliée* (see note 2), p. 11; Timbert, *Vézelay* (see note 5), p. 67-68.

liturgical choir seems to have been located west of the crossing, in the easternmost bays of the nave. Peter Diemer found evidence of a heightened floor level in the three eastern bays of the inner nave vessel. The height of the bases of the main arcade responds facing the inner vessel and tell-tale signs of scarring and repair on these responds suggest that Romanesque choir was located in these bays.[22] Neil Stratford and Lydwine Saulnier have added that, to mark the choir, eight re-used capitals from around 1100 were inserted in these bays.[23] Moreover, in the thirteenth century, the four easternmost nave bays were vaulted with rib-vaults, perhaps indicating the extent of the liturgical choir at that time (presumably, one bay longer than the Romanesque liturgical choir).[24] The archaeological evidence is confirmed by two eighteenth-century sources, which report that the previous choir advanced far into the nave.[25] Moreover, for the early nineteenth-century canon of Vézelay, Nicolas-Leonard Martin, there was no doubt that the "ancien chœur" was situated in the four easternmost nave bays.[26] Thus, at least since the construction of the nave in the 1120s, the monks' choir was probably situated in the nave, where it remained following the reconstruction of the chevet after 1165.[27] Indeed, the architecture of the chevet itself suggests that it functioned as a sanctuary. In relation to the nave, the crossing and the central vessel of the apse are raised to accommodate the crypt underneath. To the west, the crypt's *loculus* extends half-way underneath the crossing of the transept.[28] To the east, the crypt is of the same length and width as the central vessel of the choir. Rectangular openings in the bench that supports the columns allow shafts of light to filter into the crypt. Together with the use of columns for the hemicycle, the raised sanctuary relates Vézelay to major Romanesque cult sites, such as Saint-Bênoit-sur-Loire, and to early Christian sites, both of which had already been an inspiration for Abbot Suger at Saint-Denis.[29] Therefore, like the twelfth-century east ends of Saint-Denis, Saint-Germain-des-Prés or the Trinity Chapel at Canterbury, Vézelay's new Gothic chevet extended to the east of the monks' choir, functioning as a shrine chapel for the abbey's relics.

[22] Peter DIEMER, *Stil und Ikonographie* (see note 16), p. 31-32.

[23] STRATFORD & SAULNIER, *Sculpture Oubliée* (see note 2), p. 110; for the re-used capitals see Lydwine SAULNIER, "A propos du Musée lapidaire de Vézelay", in *Bulletin Monumental*, 136, 1978, p. 63-72; in the catalogue of the nave capitals by SALET, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 173-201, the re-used capitals carry the numbers 32-38 and 65. The fact that capitals 33, 36 and 65 face the aisles speaks perhaps against the argument of the capitals marking the choir.

[24] See STRATFORD & SAULNIER, *Sculpture Oubliée* (see note 2), p.107 with note 22; 110 with note 14; 116-117 for liturgical choir. Viollet-le-Duc restored the three western rib-vaults to their original Romanesque state. See above notes 3, 4.

[25] Edmond MARTÈNE & Ursin DURAND, *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins de la congrégation de Saint-Maur*, 2 vols, Paris, 1717, vol. 1, p. 54: "Les chaires du chœur avançaient autrefois fort avant dans la nef." MARTIN, *Précis* (see note 21), p. 231-232, quotes Dom BEAUNIER, *Recueil historique des archêvechés*, 1726, with the same words.

[26] MARTIN, *Précis*, p. 242-243. Martin lists the length of the different parts of the church, from west to east, starting from the narthex. He remarks: "La nef de la première église avait 126 pieds; et le chœur 76 pieds; le chœur actuel à 86 pieds." It is clear that Martin does not talk about the same liturgical choir that was extended but rather about two different spaces because both figures, 76 *pieds* and 86 *pieds*, are needed to add up to the total length of the church which he gives correctly as 372 *pieds* (103m). This is further confirmed by his remark: "De chaque côté de l'ancien chœur était une tour". The easternmost bays of the nave are flanked by towers. Elsewhere (p. 233) Martin argues that Abbot Erard de Rochefort shortened the choir from 90 to 86 *pieds* by building a new *jubé* at the entrance to the choir, thus suggesting that by the time Abbot Erard rebuilt the *jubé*, the canons had already moved out of the nave into the architectural choir. A possible explanation is that the choir stalls were moved in 1537, after the secularization of the abbey.

[27] Until 1985, most authors followed SALET, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 81-82, in dating the chevet to 1185. KIMPEL & SUCKALE, *Gotische Architektur* (see note 27), p. 145, 546, made a strong case for a date shortly after 1165, which has most recently been supported by TIMBERT, *Vézelay* (see note 5).

[28] See John CROOK, *The Architectural Setting of the Cult of Saints in the Early Christian West c.300 - c.1200* (Oxford Historical Monographs), Oxford, p. 133-134; and TIMBERT, *Vézelay* (see note 5), p. 39-44, who argues that it is impossible to know whether the present crypt pre-dates Abbot Artald, but that the columns of the crypt were entirely re-organised in the twelfth century and the whole crypt extended and re-vaulted in the thirteenth century.

[29] Lindy GRANT, *Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis, Church and State in Early Twelfth-Century France*, London & New York, 1998, p. 260.

Vézelay claimed to hold Mary Magdalene's relics at least since 1050, when a charter from Pope Leo IX to the abbey contains the first reference to the saint.[30] Praised as an essential sojourn on the way to Compostela in the *Pilgrim's Guide* from circa 1140, the abbey's immense and growing popularity in the twelfth century provided the background for the continued re-construction campaigns of the abbey church and the monastic buildings during that period.[31] Although, at this time, the community faced conflicts with the local burghers, the counts of Nevers, the bishops of Autun, and the abbey of Cluny, Vézelay attracted visitors and donations, and was chosen as the location for Bernard's of Clairvaux rallying sermon at the start of the second crusade in 1146.[32] The principal source of all this buzzing activity was the relics of Mary Magdalene.

As Saxer has shown, as the cult developed, the community of Vézelay shaped the identity of their saint with a number of fundamental hagiographical texts. The evidence of the miracles suggests that, from the beginning, devotion to the Magdalene was conceived as a trans-regional, major pilgrimage cult. The earliest miracle, written in the eleventh century, concerns a knight from Auvergne whom the saint delivers from captivity.[33] It set the tone for the other miracles composed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: the Magdalene is above all a liberator, protector, and even resurrector of knights from all corners of medieval France, including Berry, Château-Landon, Normandy and especially Aquitaine.[34] Through this attention to knights, her miracles resemble those reported at Saint-Foy at Conques, Saint-Leonard-de-Noblat and Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire. However, in contrast to pilgrimage centres like Saint-Foy, the cult at Vézelay does not seem to have developed from a localized cult, centred on shrine cures. Only a small number of miracles are healing miracles,[35] and they do not usually concern locals but pilgrims, for example, from Vitteaux-en-Auxois or Besançon.[36] Instead, in their scope and intentions, the miracles seem to be closer to those wrought by James at Compostela, which were predominantly of pilgrimage and battle, attracting pilgrims who were seeking remission of sins more than cures.[37] It is perhaps not insignificant in this context that the Apostle's feast day, the 25 July, falls into the octave of Mary Magdalene's feast and that, as we will see, at Vézelay, apostlehood was celebrated as a major aspect of Mary Magdalene's sanctity.

Central to the comprehension of the Magdalene's sanctity at Vézelay are the two sermons of the *cycle*. In the past, the *Sermo in veneratione sanctae Mariae Magdalenae* has been attributed to Abbot Odo of Cluny (927-942). However, as Dominique Iogna-Prat has shown, this attribution is unlikely

[30] Monumenta Vizeliacensia, *Textes rélatifs à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Vézelay*, ed. Robert B. C. Huygens (*Corpus Christianorum*, *Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 42), Turnhout, 1980, charter 13, p. 291-293; see also Saxer *Le culte* (see note 16), p. 65-74.

[31] *Pilgrim's Guide*, translated Shaver-Crandell, Gerson & Stones, *The pilgrim's guide to Santiago* (see note 19), p. 74-87, here p. 78-79.

[32] The conflicts are described in Hugh's of Poitier mid-twelfth-century chronicle, see Monumenta Vizeliacensia (see note 30), p. 395-607. The main source for Bernard's sermon is Odo of Deuil, *De Profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem*, ed. Virginia G. Berry, New York, 1948, p. 8-10.

[33] *B.H.L.* 5462, see Victor Saxer, "*Miracula Beate Marie Magdalene Vizeliaci Facta*, Étude de la tradition manuscrite des Recueils de miracles de la Madeleine à Vézelay", in *Bulletin Philologique et Historique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques*, 1959, p. 69-82. Miracles *B.H.L.* 5459-5463, 5465, 5467-5471, 5473-5474 are published by Etienne-Michel Faillon, *Monuments inédits sur l'apostolat de Sainte Marie-Madeleine en Provence*, vol. 2, Paris 1865, col. 735-742.

[34] *B.H.L.* 5463, 5465/5466, 5482, 5483, 5486.

[35] Notably *B.H.L.* 5468 mentions various healings; among the miracles of the Magdalene, the *Pilgrim's Guide* (see note 19), p. 79, first mentions transgression of sins, before listing a number of cures.

[36] *B.H.L.* 5475, 5477. The locals are one blind man from Chastellux-sur-Cure and a knight from Noyers, see *B.H.L.* 5476, 5467.

[37] The distinction between localized cults and the 'pilgrimage shrines' that possess relics of major biblical persons was made by Benedicta Ward, *Miracles and the Medieval Mind, Theory, Record and Event 1000-1215*, Aldershot, 1987, p. 33-56 (for Foy and Benedict), 110-117 (for James). See also Klaus Herbers, "The Miracles of Saint James", in *The Codex Calixtinus and the Shrine of St. James*, ed. John Williams & Alison Stones (Jakobus-Studien), Tübingen, 1992, p. 11-35.

and the sermon might have been written at Vézelay specifically for the office of the 22 July.[38] The text was divided into eleven lessons. The twelfth lesson was formed by the *Sermo in solemnitate sanctae Mariae Magdalenae*, which Saxer recently recognised as a fourth-century African homily, written for Easter day, and commemorating the baptism of the neophytes the night before. Like a precious relic set in a new reliquary, the homily was therefore probably the only old text within the cycle, and undoubtedly all the more venerable because of its antiquity.[39] In the introduction to the *Sermo in veneratione*, the author describes his text as a compendium (*compendiose*) of the different biblical figures of the Magdalene, which he interprets and organises in the sense of the progression of her evangelical life. This progression is for the author both a journey and ascension: Mary Magdalene is successively (and at the same time) the sinner whose sins were washed away, the companion of the Apostles, and she to whom it was given to announce the Resurrection, the event celebrated in the *Sermo in solemnitate*.[40] Her feast, he says, is celebrated through her imitation.[41]

Given the relics' importance for the community – politically, economically and liturgically – the abbey presented the saint to its monks and visitors in what seems at first a surprisingly understated way. Mary Magdalene appears in person only on the central portal of the western façade, the abbey's main entrance. The triple portals of the western façade were completed in about 1135 with a carved Last Judgement scene on the central tympanum and plain, unsculpted lateral tympana, originally perhaps painted.[42] Since Viollet-le-Duc's restoration of the façade (1846-53), the central tympanum and its lintel have been replaced (Fig. 1), but the original tympanum and lintel, almost totally effaced during the Revolution, still survive. The scene on the right side of the surviving lintel can be identified as the meal in the house of Simon (John 12, 1-9) (Fig. 4). Prostrated on the floor beneath the table, Mary of Bethany is anointing and wiping the feet of Christ with her hair. The main scene on the left side of the lintel probably showed the Resurrection of Lazarus which precedes the meal in the house of Simon (John, 11).[43] Gregory the Great's homilies had already identified both Mary of Bethany and Luke's sinner in the house of the Pharisee (Luke 7, 36-50) with Mary Magdalene.[44] Like Mary of Bethany, the sinner had washed Christ's feet with her hair and, and because "she loved much", she was forgiven. Thus, on a first level of interpretation, the saint is represented on the portal as the repentant sinner. Similarly, on the lintel of a twelfth-century portal in the south of Burgundy, at Neuilly-en-

[38] Dominique Iogna-Pratt, "'Bienheureuse Polysémie' La Madeleine du *Sermo in veneratione Mariae Magdalenae* attribué à Odon de Cluny", in *Marie Madeleine dans la mystique, les arts et les lettres* (Actes du Colloque International, Avignon 1988), ed. Eve Duperray, Paris, 1989, p. 22-31; Dominique Iogna-Pratt, "La Madeleine du *Sermo in veneratione sanctae Mariae Magdalenae* attribué à Odon de Cluny", in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen-Age*, 104/1, 1992, p. 37-70.

[39] *B.H.L.* 5439. For the liturgical use of the text, see Saxer, *Le culte*, p. 173-182. For the edition and discussion of the *Sermo in solemnitate*, see Victor Saxer, "Un sermon médiéval sur la Madeleine, reprise d'une homélie antique pour Paques attribuable à Opat de Milève (d. 392)", in *Revue bénédictine*, 80, 1970, p. 17-50.

[40] *Sermo in veneratione…* , *P.L.*, 133, col. 713-721 (714C) : *Quam vero pius et missericors erga conversos peccatores exstiterit Deus, istius comprobat perfectio, quae non solum criminis promervit ablutionem, sed apostulorum consors effecta, illis donata est Dominicae Resurrectionis nuntia.* See Iogna-Pratt, "La Madeleine" (see note 38), p. 45.

[41] *Sermo in veneratione…* , *P.L.*, 133, col. 713C: *Quanquam per quatuor mundi climata, fidelium connexione propagata, sacratissimae Mariae Magdalenae insignia, piae imitationis exemplo sacrosancta celebret Ecclesia*. See also Sazama, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 53.

[42] Salet, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 66. Stratford & Saulnier, *Sculpture Oubliée* (see note 2), p. 33.

[43] Stratford & Saulnier, *Sculpture oubliée* (see note 2), p. 28, 34-35. Among the evidence is a description by Dom Plancher from of 12-13 May 1726 and Viollet-le-Duc's drawing (*Ibidem*, fig. 25) of the western portal. This drawing also allows the identification of the left scene. See also Peter Diemer, "Das Pfingstportal von Vézelay: Wege, Umwege und Abwege einer Diskussion", in *Jahrbuch des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte*, 1, 1985, p. 77-114, here p. 110-111 note 97, and Sazama, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 46-47.

[44] Gregory the Great, "Homilies" XXV, XXXIII, *P.L.*, 76, cols. 1189B, 1239C. See also Saxer, *La Madeleine* (see note 16), p. 3. Sazama, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 46-54, also highlights the penitential meaning of the scene.

Fig. 4 Vézelay, La Madeleine, right side of the lintel of the western central portal showing the meal in the house of Simon (John 12, 1-9) (now deposited on the south side of the abbey church) (Alexandra Gajewski)

Donjon (Allier), the meal in the house of Simon is shown next to Adam and Eve from Genesis, thus closely associating Eve's original sin with the healing, penitential act of Mary Magdalene.[45] In the *Sermo in veneratione*, Mary Magdalene, is also first of all the historical figure, the rich girl, born in a castle (*Magdalo castello*), who slips into voluptuousness and sin. However, with God's grace and compassion she repents and gives to Christ her body (tears, hair and kisses) and the ointment, and is forgiven.[46] Equally, the author of the *Pilgrim's Guide*, whether he had actually seen the Vézelay façade or was working from the hagiographical texts, first presents the Magdalene in this way:[47]

"Next, on the road that goes to Santiago through St-Leonard, the most worthy body of the blessed Mary Magdalene must first be venerated by pilgrims and rightly so. For she is that glorious Mary, who, in the house of Simon the Leper, moistened with her tears the feet of the Saviour, wiped them with her hair, and anointed them with her precious ointment while kissing them assiduously, on

[45] See Xavier Barral i Altet, "L'image pénitentielle de la Madeleine dans l'art monumental roman", in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome, Moyen-Age*, 104/1, 1992, p. 181-185.

[46] *Sermo in veneratione…* , *P.L.*, 133, col. 714D-714D; see Iogna-Pratt, "La Madeleine" (see note 38), p. 45-46.

[47] Shaver-Crandell & Gerson, *The Pilgrim's Guide* (see note 19), p. 29, 54, argue that chapter VIII of the pilgrim's guide was compiled from different hagiographical sources. Indeed, there is no suggestion in the passage on Vézelay that the author was describing the building itself. However, as I will argue, the church and its sculpture reflect the way in which Mary Magdalene's sanctity was conceived textually at Vézelay, and it is telling that the author of the *Guide*, who presumably uses the same texts, describes the Magdalene just as she was presented on the building.

account of which her many sins were forgiven her, because she greatly loved the Lover of all the world, that is Jesus Christ, her Redeemer."[48]

The *Sermo in veneratione* also contains a section on the Resurrection of Lazarus, Mary of Bethany's brother, some of whose relics the abbey also possessed.[49] By linking Mary Magdalene's washing of Christ's feet with the Resurrection scene on the lintel, the portal further highlights the historical context of the saint's life. Moreover, according to the *Sermo*, the Raising of Lazarus was a symbol of repentance and spiritual resurrection, underscoring the penitential message of the portal sculpture.[50] And, as in the figurative group carved for tomb of Lazarus at Autun, dating to the 1140s, Mary Magdalene role's in the scene of resurrection already points to the events linking the saint with the resurrection of Christ.[51] On a deeper level of understanding, therefore, the lintel broadens the subject of the Last Judgement on the tympanum, by promising spiritual resurrection to those who follow the example of the saint and are about to enter the abbey church.[52]

It is immediately obvious to anyone arriving in the inner narthex that the Magdalen is absent from the imagery of the portals, dated to after a fire in 1120.[53] The tympanum on the north side shows the journey to Emmaus and the resurrected Christ among the Apostles, the south tympanum the Nativity.[54] In the central tympanum Christ is shown on a throne in a mandorla with his arms outstretched (Fig. 2); the rays emanating from his hands touch the Apostles flanking the throne. In an influential paper, Adolf Katzenellenbogen once identified the subject as an iconographical "telescoping" of several chronologically separate Gospel episodes: the Mission, given by Christ to his Apostles during his life-time (e.g. Matthew 10, 1-8 and 18, 18) and just before his Ascension (e.g. Mark 16, 1-18), the Ascension, and the Pentecost.[55] More recently, however, Diemer demonstrated the superfluity of conceiving a complex conflation of different scenes: since the idea of the Mission forms part of the events surrounding the day of Pentecost with its miracle of languages (Acts 2, 6), Peter's sermon to the Jews (Acts 2, 14-36), and the baptism of three thousand souls (Acts 2, 41), the tympanum's subject can be identified as a representation of Pentecost.[56] Evidence for the importance of the Mission theme at Vézelay is provided by the curious groups of figures in the radiating compartments and on the lintel, which Emile Mâle identified as the people of the world, including the

[48] *Pilgrim's Guide*, ed. SHAVER-CRANDELL & GERSON, *The Pilgrim's Guide* (see note 19), p. 78-79.

[49] *Sermo in veneratione…*, *P.L.*, 133, col. 717A-718A. Vézelay possessed relics of both Lazarus and Martha. See Charter 57 in Monumenta Vizeliacensia (see note 30), p. 362-365, here p. 363.

[50] IOGNA-PRATT, "La Madeleine" (see note 38), p. 50; see also SAZAMA, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 46-50.

[51] See BARRAL I ALTET, "L'image pénitentielle" (see note 45); for the tomb at Autun see *Le tombeau de Saint Lazare et la sculpture romane à Autun après Gislebertus* (exhibition catalogue, Musée Rolin, Autun, 8 June - 15 September 1985), Autun, 1985. Mary Magdalene's anointing of Christ's feet presaged Christ's death, see John 12, 7.

[52] According to SAZAMA, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 54: "At Vézelay, the combination of Mary Magdalene washing Christ's Feet with the Raising of Lazarus below Christ in Majesty specifies the need for the faithful to submit to penance instead of waiting for the Last Judgement."

[53] SALET, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 39-48.

[54] For the interpretation of the lateral portals and their link with the central portal, see DIEMER, "Das Pfingstportal" (see note 43), p. 97-98; and Marcel ANGHEBEN, "Apocalypse XXI-XXII et l'iconographie du portail central de la nef de Vézelay", in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 41, 1998, p. 209-240, here p. 237-240.

[55] Adolf KATZENELLENBOGEN, "The Central Tympanum at Vézelay: its Encyclopedic Meaning and its Relation to the First Crusade", in *The Art Bulletin*, 26/3, 1944, p. 141-151. In the early twentieth century, the objection to recognizing the subject as the Pentecost was the presence of Christ on the tympanum where one would expect just a dove. However, Emile MÂLE, *L'art réligieux au XIIe siècle en France, étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du Moyen Age*, 8th edition, Paris, 1998, p. 327, could show that the depiction with Christ was paralleled in an image of the Pentecost from a Cluny lectionary (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouv. acq. Lat. 2246, fol. 79 v°). For the dispute, see DIEMER, "Das Pfingstportal" (see note 43), p. 80-85. For the most recent discussion of the portal see DIEMER & DIEMER, "Le grand protail" (see note 1) with p. 213 note 8 for an up-to-date bibliography of the portal sculpture.

[56] DIEMER, "Das Pfingstportal", p. 88. Previously, Michael D. TAYLOR, "The Pentecost at Vézelay", *Gesta*, 19, 1980, p. 9-15, had also argued that the subject should be identified as the Pentecost and not as the Mission.

monstrous races to whom the Apostles preached the Gospels.[57] Indeed, the apostolic theme is emphasised by the Apostles' appearance on three levels, always clearly identifiable by Peter's key: all twelve are shown in the central tympanum; below, to the right of Christ's feet, and facing the procession on the lintel, Peter and, probably, Paul can be seen.[58] Finally, the innermost door jambs and the sides of the trumeau are decorated with six figures, at least three of which represent Apostles, including again Peter. The apostolic motif and the evangelical message of the tympanum suggest that, together with the foundation of the Church at Pentecost, the central scene evokes the beginning of the Mission and its perpetuation by the Church.[59]

At the centre, on the trumeau, where we might perhaps have expected a figure of Mary Magdalene, John the Baptist can be seen, holding a dish which once depicted the *agnus dei* and was inscribed "Behold the lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the world." (John 1, 29)[60] As Mâle explained, in a sermon on the Pentecost, Abbot Odilo of Cluny (994 – circa 1048) had commented on the prediction of the Baptist "I indeed have baptised you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Mark 1, 8) Moreover, Mâle argued, the figure emphasises the role of baptism which allows all the people coming to Christ entrance into the Church community. Diemer, finally, drew attention to the position of the figure which every visitor had to pass on entering the church.[61] In this way, the Baptist addresses each viewer and extends the theme of the evangelising Church shown on the tympanum. According to the inscription on the socle, John the Baptist "converts the people by making Christ known to them with a sign",[62] for, according to John (1, 36-37), the Baptist is also a proto-Apostle who converted the first two disciples to Christ by enjoining them, as does the Baptist figure at Vézelay, to "Behold the lamb of God".

[57] MÂLE, *L'art réligieux* (see note 55), p. 328-332, based on Acts 2, 9-11.

[58] MÂLE, *L'art réligieux*, p. 331.

[59] See already Mâle, *L'art réligieux*, p. 331, for whom Peter and Paul on the lintel are "les plus fameux d'entre les missionaires de l'Evangile, ils sont le symbole de Rome elle-même et de l'unité de la foi." While, TAYLOR, "The Pentecost" (see note 56), minimized the importance of the Mission for the tympanum, other recent authors have re-emphasized it. See ANGHEBEN, "Apocalypse" (see note 54), p. 237; and by the same author "Le programme iconographique du rez-de-chaussée de l'avant-nefs de Vézelay: châpiteaux et portails", in *Avant-nefs & espaces d'accueil dans l'église entre le IVe et le XIIe siècle*, ed. Christian SAPIN, Paris, 2002, p. 450-463; and SAZAMA, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 58-68.

[60] For the inscription see Eugène VIOLLET-LE-DUC, *Monographie de l'ancienne abbatiale de Vézelay*, Paris, 1973, p. 16. Together with Lazarus and Martha, Mary Magdalene is depicted on the nineteenth-century reconstruction of the trumeau of the western portal at Autun. It is unclear to what extent it reflects the original, probably dating to the early 1130s, see Denis GRIVOT & George ZARNECKI, *Giselbertus, Sculptor of Autun*, New York, 1985, p. 26, 162.

[61] MÂLE, *L'art réligieux* (see note 55), p. 331; for the sermon see *P.L.*, 142, col.1014-1019; DIEMER, "Das Pfingstportal" (see note 43), p. 98. Diemer also points out that in the twelfth century baptisms usually took place at Easter and Pentecost. For ANGHEBEN, "Apocalypse" (see note 54), p. 216-218, John the Baptist holding the lamb is a reference to Revelation 21, 22 since, in his interpretation, the portal is an allusion to the Apocalypse. For SAZAMA, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 74-78, the figure highlights the monastic community's claim to baptize. Low, "'You who once'" (see note 8), p. 473, argues that the Baptist is shown in his role as a prophet. On the connection between baptism and pilgrimage see also SUMPTION, *Pilgrimage* (see note 20), p. 129-130.

[62] The inscription on the socle of the John the Baptist figure was fully idenitified by DIEMER, *Stil und Ikonographie* (see note 16), p. 439-442: *Agnoscant quia dicitur iste Johannes, convertet populum demonstrans indice Christum*. Diemer also links the inscription to John's preaching in the wilderness, see Matthew 3, 1; Mark 1, 4; Luke 3, 3.

Fig. 5 Anonymous drawing with inscription: "Zodiaque sculpté sur le portail de l'église de la Magdelaine de Vézelay […] dessiné en 1807" (Charenton-sur-Pont, Médiathèque de l'architecture et du patrimoine, CRMH 2977)

While the presence of the Baptist is justified iconographically, the figure raises an archaeological problem. Salet observed that it does not fit its placement and is not attached to the column in front of which it stands.[63] The exact nature of the initial scheme remains uncertain.[64] Moreover, behind the head of the Baptist a hole or niche is visible. A drawing from 1807 shows a damaged sculpture, a female torso, in the place above the head of Christ (Fig. 5). Stratford and Saulnier tentatively identified the bust as a figure of the Virgin, whereas Diemer and Diemer suggested it might represent the king of the Cosmos often shown in manuscript illuminations of the Pentecost.[65] Yet, the most likely figure in this place would be Mary Magdalene, who, according to the *Sermo in veneratione*, washed the feet

[63] Francis Salet, "La Madeleine de Vézelay, Notes sur la façade de la nef", in *Bulletin Monumental*, 99, 1940, p. 223-237. Salet, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 42-49. Salet thought that the façade was heightened after the plan to build an open porch was abandoned and the present narthex was built. Diemer, *Stil und Ikonographie* (see note 16), p. 42-56, and Diemer & Diemer, "Le grand protail" (see note 1), p. 194, argued against a heightening; but see Kristina Krüger, *Die romanischen Westbauten in Burgund und Cluny*, Berlin, 2003, p. 113-115. Christian Beutler, "Das Tympanum zu Vézelay", in *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, 29, 1967, p. 7-30, connected the change of plan with a change in the iconography, but see Salet's response in *Bulletin Monumental*, 126, 1968, p. 185-188.

[64] Salet, "La Madeleine de Vézelay" (see note 63), p. 229, argued that John the Baptist was intended for the trumeau of the original tympanum; Diemer, *Stil und Ikonographie* (see note 16), p. 54, suggested that the figure might have been intended for the lower trumeau.

[65] Stratford & Saulnier, *Sculpture oubliée* (see note 2), p. 77 with note 11; Diemer & Diemer , "Le grand portail" (see note 1), p. 193 ; see also Neil Stratford, "Pour une archéologie du grand portail de Vézelay", in *Cluny* (see note 1), p. 214-219. John McNeill kindly pointed out to me that the hole might also be a reliquary socket that contained relics of Mary Magdalene.

of the *plasmator* (creator). Then, following her repentance, she became the companion of the Apostles and on the tympanum she would have been depicted next to Peter and Paul.[66] Moreover, for the author of the sermon, Mary's position at Christ's feet designates her role as a contemplative who attends Christ's words.[67] Positioned above the head of John the Baptist on the tympanum, she is the perfect counterpart to the Baptist, who lived as a hermit. On the Anglo-Saxon Ruthwell Cross Luke's sinner wiping Christ's hair is depicted on the opposite side to what is probably John the Baptist.[68] Both comprehend the forgiveness of sin and both recognise Christ. Furthermore, in the Vézelay exegesis of Mary Magdalene, they also share an association with baptism and the establishment of the Ecclesia, for the *Sermo in solemnitate* interprets Mary Magdalene's meeting with the resurrected Christ as the marriage of Ecclesia with Christ that takes place during baptism.[69] As the writer of the *Sermo in veneratione* explained, mystically Mary Magdalene designates Ecclesia. Just as she was washing with the tears of her penitence, the Church washes the old idolatries with the water of baptism: "At the feet of God she founded (*fundit*) the faithful."[70]

The *Vitae* add a further aspect to Mary Magdalene's apostolic role, relating that, after the death of Christ, the "Apostle of Apostles" left the Holy Land.[71] According to the *Vita apostolica*, she arrived in Provence in the company of Saint Maximin, and the two saints converted the people by the example of their austere life. Mary Magdalene subsequently died, while Maximin continued evangelizing the region.[72] The author of the *Pilgrim's Guide*, having explained the Magdalene's penitential role, also relates her missionary life in Provence:

> "It is she, in truth, who, after the Ascension of the Lord, arrived by sea from the region of Jerusalem with the blessed Maximinus, disciple of Christ, and other disciples of the Lord, in the land of Provence, (p. 79) that is, through the port of Marseille, in which land she led a celibate life for several years and finally was buried in the city of Aix by the same Maximinus, who had become bishop of the city."[73]

If we accept the presence of Mary Magdalene on the tympanum, the eccentric people of the world can also be seen as a reference to her missionary work as an Evangelist. This aspect of her sanctity would have been important at time when apostolic saints, such as James, were firing the popular imagination, and evangelising saints, like Martial at Limoges, were raised to the ranks of the Apostles.[74] However, for the community at Vézelay, the Magdalene's role as a woman Evangelist presented a predicament: as the *Vita omnipotentis* explains, women were not allowed to preach publicly. That role fell to Lazarus,

[66] *Sermo in veneratione…* , *P.L.*, 133, col. 714D: *…sui plasmatoris pedes coepit rigare…*; for Mary Magdalene as the faithful servant of Christ see 715B.

[67] *Sermo in veneratione…* , *P.L.*, 133, col. 716C-717A.

[68] For a recent discussion of the iconography and the identification of the shepherd figure, see Jane Hawkes, Éamonn Ó Carragáin & Ross Trench-Jellicoe, "John the Baptist and the 'Agnus Dei': Ruthwell (and Bewcastle) revisited", in *The Antiquaries Journal*, 81, 2001, p. 131-153. Mary Magdalene's depiction on the Ruthwell Cross is also discussed in Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalene, Myth and Metaphor*, London 1994, p. 109.

[69] Saxer, "Un sermon médiéval" (see note 39).

[70] *Sermo in veneratione…* , *P.L.*, 133, col. 715B-D: *Mystice autem haec beatissima mulier sanctam designat Ecclesiam… utique in pedes Domini unguentum nardi pisticum, id est fidelem, fundit.*; see Iogna-Pratt, "La Madeleine" (see note 38), p. 46-47.

[71] *Vita apostolica* (see note 17); *Vita omnipotentis* (see note 18), p. 145. The term *apostola apostolorum* is used in the *Vita omnipotentis*, p. 145.

[72] *Vita apostolica*, p. 165-168. See also Elisabeth Pinto-Mathieu, *Marie-Madeleine dans la littérature du Moyen Age*, Paris, 1997, p. 99-100.

[73] *Pilgrim's Guide* (see note 19), p. 78-79.

[74] See Alain Dierkens, "Martial, Sernin, Trophime et les autres: à propos des évangélisateurs et des apôtres en Gaule", in *Saint-Martial de Limoges: ambition politique et production culturelle (X e-XIIIe siècles)*, ed. Claude Andrault-Schmitt, Limoges, 2006, p. 25-38.

or in the *Vita apostolica* to Maximin.[75] It is tempting to speculate that for this reason the Magdalene could not be represented in a central position on the trumeau.

Although the identity of the small bust at Vézelay cannot be finally established, representing the patron saint in this way would not be without parallels. At Sainte-Foy at Conques, the small kneeling figure of St Faith is depicted in a spandrel on the left side of the tympanum. Although proportionately Faith is diminutive compared to the other figures, the saint's role as the main intercessor next to the Virgin makes her the key to the portal's salvific message.[76] Equally, at Vézelay, it is the context of the Magdalene cult that helps elucidate the choice of Pentecost as the subject for the tympanum since its themes of apostlehood and baptism are also those that define the Magdalene's sanctity in the hagiographical texts.

Thus, a sculptural spectacle unfolds on the two facades that closely reflects the saint's evolution in the hagiographical texts: first inviting the viewer to identify with the penitential Mary Magdalene on the western façade, and then, by announcing her role as Apostle, contemplative, and pre-figuration of the Ecclesia on the nave portal, engaging the viewer to experience the purifying effects of a baptism and to cross the threshold into the main church. The spatial logic of the abbey church with its only access from the west supports that idea.

But who were those viewers: pilgrims, monks or members of the local community? In the past, each group has been suggested as the intended recipient of the narthex tympanum's complex message. For Diemer, the portal's Christological and ecclesiological subject-matter suggest that it was not aimed at the laity but above all addressed to the monks themselves, whose liturgical processions would have stopped in the narthex, as described in the Cluniac customaries.[77] Indeed, Kristina Krüger explains that the specific iconography of the Pentecost tympanum with its allusion to Christ in Majesty and the Mission motif would have resonated deeply with the monks whose station at the portal, in the Cluniac tradition, celebrated the encounter between the disciples and the Resurrected.[78] At the same time, as Kristin Sazama's and Krüger's readings of the customaries show, the narthex was also a point of encounter between the monks and the laity, including both the local community and visiting dignitaries.[79] Several authors, therefore, argue that the narthex portal addressed the laity. Sazama, for example, thinks that the message of the narthex portal was to remind the laity of the spiritual authority of the monks,[80] while for Judy Scott Feldman the lintel is an image of the procession of tithe-payers, pilgrims and knights to the abbey.[81] All these arguments highlight important liturgical, contextual and social issues

[75] *Vita omnipotentis* (see note 18), p. 146.: "Sed quia muliebri sexui noverat prohibitum publicis auditibus non debere inferre sermonem." See Guy LOBRICHON, "La Madeleine des Bourguignons aux XIe et XIIe siècles", in *Marie Madeleine dans la mystique, les arts et les lettres* (Actes du Colloque International, Avignon 1988), ed. Eve DUPERRAY, Paris, 1989, p. 71-88, here p. 77-79.

[76] See Willibald SAUERLÄNDER, "'Omnes perversi sic sunt in tartara mersi': Skulptur als Bildpredigt; das Weltgerichtstympanum von Sainte-Foy in Conques", in *Jahrbuch der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 1979, p. 34-47.

[77] DIEMER, "Das Pfingstportal" (see note 43), p. 100-104; for the use of narthexes in processions within the Cluniac context, see KRÜGER, *Westbauten* (see note 63), p. 237-244.

[78] KRÜGER, *Westbauten*, p. 295-297, 302

[79] SAZAMA, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 81-95; Kristin M. SAZAMA, "Le rôle de la tribune de Vézelay à travers son iconographie: réflexions sur deux châpiteaux de la tribune et leur rapport avec la fonction commémorative des chapelles hautes dédiées à Saint Michel", in *Avant-nefs & espaces d'accueil dans l'église entre le IVe et le XIIe siècle*, ed. Christian SAPIN, Paris, 2002, p. 440-449; KRÜGER, *Westbauten* (see note 63), p. 259-261, 295-297.

[80] SAZAMA, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 58-80.

[81] Judy Scott FELDMAN, *The Narthex Portal at Vézelay: Art and Monastic Self-Image*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Texas, Austin, 1986. TAYLOR, "The Pentecost", (see note 56), claims that the tympanum was aimed at the counts of Nevers, and LOW, " 'You who were' " (see note 8) argues that it was aimed at the lay congregation, representing the *Missa Major* on the lintel.

that might indeed have provoked diverse responses to the sculpture from its viewers, but as overall explanations for the tympanum they are problematic. They search for the sculpture's intended meaning in the abbey's concerns with a particular audience and assume the tympanum addresses a group of viewers on their (assumed) individual level, either the monks on a theological level or the laity in a more direct way, by imposing authority or extorting gifts. However, as Crossley argued, a principle objective of exterior architectural sculpture was to act as a preparation for the imagery, sacred places, and rituals inside the church.[82] On one fundamental level of interpretation then, the sculpture's message is intrinsic to the place and thus addresses everybody. At Vézelay, where diverse interpretations might have resonated in different viewers' minds, the iconographic backbone of the portal programme was the Magdalene's sanctity, referring to the cult that was the essence of the abbey's spiritual and economic existence. Although its meaning was perhaps most deeply interiorised by the monks, the pilgrims and the laity would have undoubtedly recognized the sculpture's main function: to prepare the viewers for what lay beyond the threshold: for the tomb of the saint herself.[83]

We can only speculate about the route taken by these groups once they crossed the entrance. When the church doors were open, the western parts of the nave, probably the *ecclesia peregrinorum* mentioned in the Vézelay Chronicle, were accessible to the laity.[84] Until 1267, when they were translated and exhibited, the relics remained in the crypt and were rarely shown.[85] For the majority of faithful, therefore, the architecture of the sanctuary, visible in the distance, behind the monks' choir, would have been the only tangible sign of the saint's presence. For those, probably few, pilgrims who were allowed into the crypt, the only entrance on the south side of the Gothic ambulatory would have led them beyond the monk's choir into the east end.[86] As for the monks, the Cluniac customaries show that processions on the main feast days led from the cloister into the narthex (*galilaea*), from there into the nave and then into the monk's choir.[87] During the octave of the Magdalene, the altar of the saint would have undoubtedly been included in the processions.[88] Although it is unknown whether the itinerary of the processions on 22 July included a station in front of the two façades, it seems at least likely that the procession would have accessed the church from the west and continued to the Magdalene altar in the east.

[82] Crossley, "Ductus and memoria" (see note 14), p. 213.
[83] See also Krüger, *Westbauten* (see note 8), p.118.
[84] Krüger, *Westbauten*, p. 113 with note 653; for the opening of the doors Krüger refers to the *Antiquiores Consuetudines Cluniacenses*, lib. 3, cap. xii, *De Apocrisiario* in *P.L.*, 149, col. 753-754. The *ecclesia peregrinores* was dedicated in 1132, and Krüger convincingly argues that the term must refer to the abbey church and not to a separate chapel, as was proposed by Francis Salet, "La Madeleine de Vézelay et ses dates de construction", in *Bulletin Monumental*, 95, 1936, p. 5-25, here p. 6-17.
[85] In fact, one of the reasons for the decline in pilgrims stated in the 1265-67 report was the fact that the relics were so rarely shown. In 1265 they were found under the main altar in the crypt. See Saxer, *Le culte* (see note 16), p. 185-196, and Saxer, *Le dossier vézelien de Marie-Madeleine: invention et translation des reliques en 1265-1267: contribution à l'histoire du culte de la sainte à Vézelay à l'apogée du Moyen Age* (*Subsidia hagiographica*, 57), Brussels, 1975. I believe, therefore, that Crook, *The Architectural Setting* (see note 28), p. 133-134, is mistaken in thinking the relics were brought into the upper sanctuary in the twelfth century.
[86] Viollet-le-Duc recreated the Romanesque entrances to the crypt in the transept and closed the entrance from the sanctuary. See Timbert, *Vézelay* (see note 5), p. 78.
[87] Krüger, *Westbauten*, p. 101, 259-261. Krüger (*Westbauten*, p. 124) assumes that the Vézelay narthex could be accessed from the cloister. However, on Viollet-le-Duc's pre-restoration drawings there is no door on the south side of the narthex and the masonry shows no disturbance. If there was no access, the procession either entered the narthex from the nave, or the monks left the enclosure and re-entered the church through the western portal.
[88] See Saxer, *Le culte* (see note 16), p. 320-321. According to a thirteenth-century ordinary from Laon, one of the few to contain a detailed description of the feast of 22 July, a procession made its way to the saint's altar at the end of vespers and during matins.

Fig. 6 Vézelay, La Madeleine, schematic section and ground-plan (Pierre Pizzo after Francis Salet, *La Madeleine de Vézelay* (Étude iconographique par Jean Adhémar), Melun, 1948)

On entering the main church, there is a sense of progression and an element of suspense as the viewer advances eastwards through the ten bays of the nave which provided space for pilgrims and monks (Figs. 3, 6). Beyond the nave, the Gothic chevet promises a realm of a different kind: its (now as then) unpolychromed greyish limestone walls and the tall windows in the choir ambulatory and clerestorey produce a pool of light in the east.[89] No attempt was made to adapt the choir's architecture to that of the nave with its two-storey elevation and cruciform piers. In the chevet, the elevation is perched on slender monolithic columns (Fig. 7). Its shafts and colonnettes appear fragile and delicate compared with the columnar responds in the nave. As mentioned above, the springing level of the vault is not, as was customary in the period, anchored at the level of the window sills, but instead the vault capitals float above the sill, thereby both preventing the windows from being obscured by the vault cells and blurring the limits between vault and elevation. Indeed, the main characteristic of this architecture seems to be the dissimulation of boundaries. The whole vaulting system is desynchronized in relation to the ground plan (Fig. 6): the arch at the opening of the apse springs from small corbels, and below – where one would expect a heavy pair of piers – slender columns (twin columns on the north side) have been added to the arcades of the eastern choir bay.[90]

[89] See Mathieu Brinkert & Lorenzo Diez, "Vézelay, un projet de lumière. Analyse des ambiances lumineuses de la basilique Sainte-Marie-Madeleine", unpublished *Mémoire*, Ecole d'Architecture de Strasbourg, ed. Philoména Miller-Chagas, October 1994, p. 74-75, which shows that today the difference in luminosity between the nave and the choir can be up to 24000 Lux in the summer and is still circa 1800 Lux in the winter. I am grateful to Susann Schlesinger for sending me a copy of this essay.

[90] For the architecture see Salet, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 69-76; Alexandra (Gajewski) Kennedy, "Gothic Architecture in northern Burgundy in the 12th and early 13th centuries", unpublished doctoral thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1996, p. 223-279; Bruno Klein, "Beginn und Ausformung der gotischen Architektur in Frankreich und seinen Nachbarländern", in *Die Kunst der Gotik: Architektur, Skulptur, Malerei*, ed. Rolf Toman, Cologne, 1998, 69-70; Christopher Wilson, "Lausanne and Canterbury", p. 105, 107 and Timbert, *Vézelay* (see note 5), p. 95-132.

Fig. 7 Vézelay, La Madeleine, east end (Alexandra Gajewski)

This unique and unorthodox construction has bewildered scholars and, despite the praise they reserved for the church as a whole, it was often considered a failure compared to the structural logic of contemporary Ile-de-France choirs.[91] However, seen not from an Ile-de-France perspective but in the context of the Vézelay cult, the architecture can be understood to be befitting its functions as a sanctuary for Mary Magdalene. According to the liturgical texts, Mary Magdalene's true sanctity revealed itself at the end of a long spiritual ascent, at Easter, to which the seventh to eleventh lessons of the *Sermo in veneratione* are devoted.[92] Stronger than the apostles in her love and constancy, she remained with Christ and was rewarded by being the first to see the risen Christ who charged her to announce his resurrection to the Apostles. Like the Virgin, Mary Magdalene is the new Eve and the "*stella maris*".[93] Finally, the twelfth lesson, the homily or *Sermo in solemnitate*, concerns the mystery of the Magdalene's sanctity. In the first place, she is the biblical figure, the myrrophore who goes to find the body of Christ (John 20, 11-18). However, it soon becomes clear that she is also the lover of the Song of Songs and the Ecclesia. It is through her that the gardener can be recognised as Christ and as the bridegroom, that sins are washed away in baptism just as the virgins of the Apocalypse washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the lamb (Rev 7, 14), and that the neophytes can join the "mater Ecclesia".[94] At the end of her ascension Mary Magdalene therefore becomes the key to salvation. The texts use comparisons to define the compound character of the saint's sanctity and metaphors evoking radiance and brilliance to express the saint's purification. Seen in this light, the chevet that at the end of the ten bays of the nave marries luminosity, complexity and delicacy of structure can be understood to suitably commemorate the relics it holds, visualising an apotheosis that also awaits those that follow the saint's example. By re-vaulting the four easternmost nave bays with rib-vaults, the choir monks would have become permanently associated with their saint's ultimate glory. In fact, of the two key-stones that remain from these vaults, one shows the Coronation of the Virgin and the other the Appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene (Fig. 8).[95]

The Mary Magdalene of the Vézelay texts is no ordinary saint of exemplary virtues. She is, as Dominique Iogna-Prat argued, the "maîtresse d'exégèse", equally a historical figure, the pre-figuration of the Church and a model of the inner life. The central aspect of this multifaceted sanctity is the sense of progress which characterises the different types the saint represents: from the repentant sinner to the companion of Christ and the Apostles to becoming Apostle to the Apostles and through her recognition of Christ a path to salvation. In the sculpture and architecture of Vézelay, this evolving sanctity is monumentalised in a series of images and views, unfolding from west to east, investing the building with a sense of journey and drama, and culminating in the architecture of the saint's sanctuary. The relationship between the hagiographical texts and the architecture and images of the church was undoubtedly a flexible and perhaps an indirect one. The sanctity of the Magdalene that is evoked

[91] SALET, *Madeleine* (see note 6), p. 70, 72, in particular, was torn between the "singulière beauté" of the choir and the "maladresses" and "gaucheries" of the architecture.

[92] Saxer has reconstituted the divisions into lessons; see *Le Culte* (see note 16), p. 179.

[93] *Sermo in veneratione*… , *P.L.*, 133, col. 718A-821C (end).

[94] *Sermo in solemnitate*…(see note 39), p. 43-46, esp 42 lines 11-12, 44 lines 38-39, 46 line 71. See also SAXER, "Un sermon médiéval" (see note 39), p. 30-32, SAXER, *Le culte* (see note 16), p. 345-346, IOGNA-PRATT, "La Madeleine" (see note 38), p. 64.

[95] Vézelay is not the only saint's sanctuary in the twelfth century to show evidence of a sense of decorum. At Saint-Denis, the case of a pseudo-Dionysian influence on the design of the chevet might have been overstated, see Christoph MARKSCHIES, *Gibt es eine "Theologie" der gotischen Kathedrale? Nochmals: Suger von Saint-Denis und Sankt Dionys vom Areopag* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 1995/1), and GRANT, *Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis*, p. 270-271. However, both Christopher Wilson and Paul Binski have argued for the symbolic choice of certain features in the Trinity Chapel at Canterbury that relate to Becket's martyrdom and sanctity, including the lighting and the type of stone, see WILSON, *The Gothic Cathedral* (see note 6), p. 90; Paul BINSKI, *Becket's Crown, Art and Imagination in Gothic England*, New Haven & London, 2004, p. 3-27.

Fig. 8 Vézelay, La Madeleine, keystone from eastern bays of the nave (Vézelay, Musée de l'Œuvre Viollet-le-Duc; photo Alexandra Gajewski)

in the sermons and the other texts written and adapted at the abbey was a central part of the saint's liturgy and must have been widely understood among the community at Vézelay, over several generations of monks. It was probably not the texts, and even less an overall plan, but rather the community's idea of the Magdalene's sanctity that governed patronal decisions at different points of the construction. During the long century that saw the building of the abbey church the community created and recreated the structure around the innermost sanctum of the building that was the saint's tomb.[96] If, as Crossley suggests, symbols were for the twelfth century invitations to a journey of discovery, the spiritual pilgrimage suggested by the succession of images and views marking the access to the tomb Mary Magdalene invited the faithful to discover their way to salvation by retracing the saint's own spiritual progression.

[96] As discussed above, the church, as it presented itself from the end of the thirteenth century onwards, was the result of several, separate construction campaigns: the nave portal predates the construction of the western portal, and the latter was built only after a change of plan. For the relationship between the western portals and the nave portals see Diemer, "Das Pfingstportal" (see note 43), p. 97, and Sazama, *Assertion* (see note 8), p. 40-41.

Stories of Saint-Denis. The Rhetoric of Persuasion

Stephen Murray

The story of Gothic is generally recounted as *development* towards an end product – a church with the right combination of pointed arches, rib vaults, flying buttresses and skeletal structure. This end product having been defined, the search is undertaken retroactively to ascertain where it all began. Then, finally, the story is restored to forward mode as an etiological chain from putative origins to final manifestation. In this way, we create a self-fulfilling prophesy or entelechy with all the inevitability of a "natural" evolution.[1]

It has long been agreed that the first firmly-dated building with the requisite features of "Gothic" can be found at the abbey church of Saint-Denis, transformed in the mid-twelfth century from a small and decaying early medieval structure (with sundry additions) into the "first" Gothic building intended to rival the great "pilgrimage churches".[2] Is it a coincidence that the mythic role of Saint-Denis as the cradle of Gothic should match its mythic (fabricated) roots as the bridgehead for Christianity and the principal church of Gaul? How does architectural production relate to story telling? What was the relationship between the invention of "Gothic" and the invention of France? What was the role of narrative in the production of "reality"?

With slender columns, decorated upper walls, and wooden roof, the eighth-century Saint-Denis nave (incorrectly associated with the patronage of Dagobert) probably resembled basilicas like those of Ravenna and Monte Cassino. The church had been modified to facilitate the veneration of relics and the patronage of kings with the addition of an early-ninth-century crypt and western twin towers and porch.[3] This old church was transformed in amazingly speedy campaigns of construction under Abbot Suger between the mid-1130s and 1144: first a twin-towered, triple-portal western frontispiece, then an elevated eastern chevet forming a lantern to enshrine the tombs of the saints. [4]

Suger's authorship is associated not only with architecture and liturgical equipment, but also with a body of writing: three "books" document the abbot's contributions to the administration and consecration of the abbey church – the *Ordinatio*, the books on the Consecration, and on the Administration.[5] Art historians have invoked these writings principally to fix chronology and to pursue the assumption that extraordinary architecture demanded extraordinary philosophy. Erwin Panofsky preceded his edition with a portrayal of the abbot as a powerful and egotistical administrator and

[1] Thus, Jean Bony began with the Soissons choir, while Paul Frankl found his paradigm in the Amiens nave and the Cologne choir: Jean Bony, *French Gothic Architecture of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries,* Berkeley, 1984; Paul Frankl, *Gothic Architecture,* Harmondsworth, 1960, and new edition revised by Paul Crossley, London & New Haven, 2000. Louis Grodecki called this the "componential approach", in his *Gothic Architecture,* New York, 1978, p. 7.

[2] Paul Frankl assigned the key role in fixing the primacy of Saint-Denis to George Downing Whittington, *An Historical Survey of the Ecclesiastical Antiquities of France*, London, 1809; see Paul Frankl, *The Gothic,* Princeton, 1960, p. 498, note 18.

[3] Sumner McKnight Crosby, *The Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis,* New Haven, 1987.

[4] Suger, born in 1081, became oblate at Saint-Denis in 1090; abbot in 1121, and died in 1151.

[5] The titles were assigned by François Duschesne and by Albert Lecoy de la Marche; see Erwin Panofsky, *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St-Denis and Its Art Treasures,* Princeton, 1946, p. 141. The *Ordinatio,* written after the founding of the chevet on 14 July 1140, dealt with administrative issues. The *Libellus de consecratione ecclesiae Sancti Dionysii* was probably codified soon after the consecration of the new chevet on 11 June 1144; *De Rebus in Administratione sua Gestis* was compiled at the request of the monks in the twenty-third year of the abbot's administration (i.e. 1144-1145) very likely after the consecration of the chevet. Conrad Rudolph assigns a date as late as 1150 for *De Administratione*; see his *Artistic Change at St-Denis,* Princeton, 1990, p. 21-24.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100144

author both of the written texts, and of the Gothic church where architectural form and transcendent meaning were perfectly unified, arguing seductively that the new architecture of dematerialization drew upon the mystical writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius (confused with the patron of the monastery) in response to stinging reprimands from Bernard of Clairvaux.[6] Further developed by Otto von Simson and Hans Sedlmayr, Panofsky's ideas had an enormous impact upon the way that the story of Gothic was told for half a century.[7]

Panofsky's case has been whittled away in a stream of criticism beginning with Peter Kidson who found in Suger's writing no dependence upon the Pseudo-Dionysius.[8] He challenged the abbot's authorship of the reconstructed church insisting that masons, not abbots, build buildings. However, little attention has been paid to the correlation of the abbot's narrative with the production of "reality" in the architectural campaigns on the abbey church. What can we learn from a study of the rhetorical structure of *De Consecratione*?

The Prologue projects the power of the Trinity in a three-part dialectical construction, countering the thesis of Divine harmony with the antithesis of corporeal vexations and inner struggle: reconciliation is only possible through the intervention of the Incarnate Christ and the charity of the Holy Spirit.

This mechanism provides the key to what follows: a series of short tripartite rhetorical units in each of which a pressing *problem* necessitates *intervention* justified by signs of divine *approval* (a miracle) or by due process (monastic consent).[9] After three such event units a triple crescendo is reached in the manifestations of divine approval in the spectacular laying of the foundation of the chevet, amazingly rapid construction, and, finally, consecration and relic translation.[10]

- Problem 1: Dagobert's basilica, founded on the tomb of the saints, is too small; its entrance, narrow and ruinous, is overwhelmed by crowds. Intervention: fulfilling youthful hopes, we laid foundations for twin towers and connecting nave. Justification: funding, at first short, becomes abundant; a quarry for the columns is miraculously discovered; a column miraculously retrieved.
- Problem 2: the new frontispiece must be joined to the derelict nave. Intervention: preparations are made to repair walls and rebuild roof; difficulty in finding appropriate beams.

[6] Erwin Panofsky, *Abbot Suger*. Most recently see *Abbé Suger: œuvres, I: Ecrit sur la consécration de Saint-Denis. L'œuvre administrative. Histoire de Louis VI*, ed. Françoise Gasparri, Paris, 1996; *Abt Suger von Saint-Denis: Ausgewählte Schriften,* ed. Andreas Speer, Günther Binding et al., Darmstadt, 2000.

[7] Otto Von Simson, *The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order*, London, 1956; Hans Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale,* Zurich, 1950.

[8] Peter Kidson, "Panofsky, Suger and Saint-Denis", in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* 50, 1987, p. 1-17. The role of Hugh of Saint Victor was suggested by Kidson and emphasized by Conrad Rudolph, *Artistic Change at Saint-Denis*; Conrad Rudolph, *The 'Things of Greater Importance': Bernard of Clairvaux's Apologia and the Medieval Attitude to Art,* Philadelphia, 1990. See also Christoph Markschies, *Gibt es eine "Theologie der gotischen Kathedrale"? Nochmals, Suger von Saint-Denis und Sankt Dionys vom Areopag,* (Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1, 1995), Heidelberg, 1995, p. 16; *Abt Suger von Saint-Denis: Ausgewählte Schriften*, esp. p. 31-38; Bruno Reudenbach, "Panofsky und Suger von Saint Denis", in *Erwin Panofsky: Beiträge des Symposions, Hamburg,1992*, ed. Bruno Reudenbach, Hamburg, 1994, p. 109-122; Martin Büchsel, *Die Geburt der Gotik*, Freiburg i. Br., 1997; Willibald Sauerländer, "Struggling with a Deconstructed Panofsky", in *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside: A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky 1892-1968,* ed. Irving Lavin, Princeton, 1995, p. 385-396.

[9] Conrad Rudolph, "Building Miracles as Artistic Justification in the Early and Mid-Twelfth Century", in *Radical Art History: Internationale Anthologie, Subject: O. K. Werckmeister,* ed. Wolfgang Kersten, Zurich, 1997, p. 399-409.

[10] Gabrielle Spiegel proposed "event units" for Suger's *Life of Louis VI* where historical action is inaugurated by a disturbance to existing order; royal intervention deals with the consequences of that disturbance, and finally "correct" order is restored; see her "History as Enlightenment: Suger and the *Mos Anagogicus*", in *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis: A Symposium,* New York. 1986, p. 151-158; see also Gabrielle Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography,* Baltimore, 1997, p. 163-177.

Justification: miraculous discovery of wooden timbers; signs of divine approval in the spectacular dedication of the western frontispiece and its chapels.

- Problem 3: the crush of people around the relic chamber in the crypt. Justification: monastic assent as the construction and form of the new chevet is anticipated.
- Crescendo 1: the spectacular foundation-laying of the chevet with royal participation; the due provision of funds.
- Crescendo 2: rapid completion of the chevet; creation of the *châsses* and special altar. The gold and gems, presented by pontiffs and the king, were procured by the martyrs themselves; miracles of the windstorm and of the mutton.
- Crescendo 3 (climax): the consecration of the chevet contrasting the controlled liturgical spectacle with the uncontrolled milling of the mob. Translation of the relics. *Châsses* opened and bodies inspected. Spontaneous self-insertion on the part of the king. Spectacular consecration of all the altars.

Similarly, *De Administratione* invokes pressing circumstances in the derelict state of the old walls; excessive crowds; the need for secluded space for the eucharist; to bring the work to an end; the danger that the link between the old and new work and the west towers would be postponed. Interventions include the repairs and painting of the nave fulfilling youthful aspirations and the demolition of the old western frontispiece and construction of new. Justification comes in the counsel and prayers of the monks. Architectural gains, less fully defined than in *De Consecratione,* include the description of heavenly spaces animated through sumptuous liturgy; penitential benefits specified in the inscription on the west portal; anagogical gains through entrance through the golden door; the rapid construction of the chevet; and inscriptions recording the consecration and linking of the new space to the old. The account ends with the justification that "under the persuasion of some", Suger was urged to continue the west towers and renew the central body of the church. Divine favour came in the provision of sapphire glass. Finally came the list of sumptuous liturgical objects and inscriptions.

The prologue of *De Administratione* emphasizes the need to make stories about the building permanent through the medium of pen and ink: the author returns repeatedly to problems of intelligibility and making connections, linking beginning with end; signifier with signified. Thus, "And because the diversity of the materials [such as] gold, gems and pearls is not easily understood by the mute perception of sight without a description, we have seen to it that this work, which is intelligible only to the literate, which shines with the radiance of delightful allegories, be set down in writing. Also, we have affixed verses expounding the matter so the [allegories] may be more clearly understood".[11]

Especially powerful was the inscription said to have been displayed in the crossing where the old liturgical choir opened into the new chevet. The moment of the demolition of the old apse and the optical availability of the new work, as brilliant as a lantern, anticipated in the planning meeting of the monks, was only realized four years later. This was the moment prayed for by Suger, who had "implored Divine mercy that He Who is the One, *the beginning and the ending, Alpha and Omega,* might join a good end to a good beginning by a safe middle…".[12]

The abbot's preoccupation with the completion of the missing middle conflated his own soteriological concerns with his architectural agenda.[13] The western frontispiece was understood as the

[11] PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, "De Administratione", p. 63. The eloquence of the inscriptions resulted partly from origins in the *tituli* of Italian basilicas; it may also suggest the work of a younger, better educated monk, perhaps William, secretary and biographer; see Lindy GRANT, *Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis: Church and State in Early Twelfth-Century France,* London, 1998, p. 269; PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, p. 164, note 46; Susanne LINSCHEID-BURDICH, "Beobachtungen zu Sugers Versinschriften in *De Administratione*", in *Abt Suger von Saint-Denis: Ausgewählte Schriften,* Darmstadt, 2000, p. 112-146, and BÜCHSEL, *Die Geburt der Gotik*, p. 18.

[12] PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, "De Administratione", p. 44-45.

[13] Clark MAINES, "Good Works, Social Ties, and the Hope for Salvation: Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis", in *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis,* ed. Paula GERSON, New York, 1986, p. 77-94.

beginning, the chevet the end, and the missing middle was the nave and crossing, which, like his life, remained unredeemed. The abbot became increasingly distraught over the realization that he would not live to see the connection made.[14]

Let us now return to the linkages between the abbot's authorship of material artifacts and of written texts. We are not dealing with solitary acts of creation by an individual in a vacuum: spaces and narrative were both, in a sense, *produced* as corporate undertakings where references to known prototypes and deployment of known architectural forms and rhetorical strategies would meet the needs of different members of the group and audiences.[15] *De Administratione* gains authority from its references to a literary genre (*Gesta*) recording the deeds of bishop, abbot or pope, including the reorganization of church property, victory over predators, and reconstruction of physical plant. *De Consecratione,* on the other hand, although drawing upon the *Vita Dagoberti* and written sources from Monte Cassino, was unusual in shape, content and rhetorical style, displaying little philological connection to existing texts.[16]

A most important source was the liturgy itself, with movements, gestures, vestments and music providing references to the miraculous events that accompanied the founding of the church and an anticipation of heavenly reality at the end. The verbal rehearsal of the flashy and ephemeral liturgical performances so dear to the abbot may suggest a similar performative background for the "event units" outlined above. In each of these units the interaction of problem, intervention and justification with interspersed "payoff" accounts of liturgical events provided ideal oral gobbets to be presented to visitors or to the assembled monks as the stories of Saint-Denis.[17]

Brother William described Suger as one who enjoyed readings from the Fathers and Church History and an indefatigable storyteller who loved to keep his monks up into the night, recounting the deeds of great men he had either seen or heard of.[18] With this notion of oral origins we may complicate the role of the abbot as author – Suger may have worked from his own oral stories recorded in *aides-mémoire* to form "books" where the dynamic structure of oral narrative is still predominant – narrative resulting from the repeated telling and tailoring of stories to meet the needs of the audience.[19] The small number of surviving copies of the "books" suggests that the intended audience was a limited one, principally the monastic community itself.[20]

[14] The abbot was in his sixties: his life spanned a period of rapid change, especially the transformation of social interactions through the medium of the written page.

[15] Henri LEFEBVRE, *The Production of Space,* transl. Donald NICHOLSON-SMITH, Oxford 1991.

[16] SPEER, "Abt Sugers Schriften zur fränkischen Königsabtei Saint-Denis", in *Abt Suger von Saint-Denis: Ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 13-66, 35; PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, p. 224; Gerhard LUBICH, "Sugers Schrift *De consecratione* im Verhältnis zu vergleichbaren mittelalterlichen Texten", in *Abt Suger von Saint Denis: De Consecratione,* p. 59-63, at p. 60: "Weder Inhalt noch Gliederung verweisen damit auf Vorbilder, die die Zuordnung zu einem Quellentypus ohne weiteres möglich machen"; Andreas SPEER, "Zum philologisch-theologischen Hintergrund von *De consecratione*", *ibidem*, p. 81-93.

[17] Richard Brilliant correlates visual with rhetorical narrative in the Bayeux "Tapestry" as a series of short units; see Richard BRILLIANT, "The Bayeux Tapestry: A Stripped Narrative for their Eyes and Ears", in *Word and Image*, 7, 1991, p. 98-126. On the transition from an oral to a literate culture see Brian STOCK, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Princeton, 1983.

[18] *Abt Suger von Saint-Denis: Ausgewählte Schriften*. p. 390-391: *Lectio quidem erat de libris Patrum autenticis; aliquando de ecclesiasticis aliquid legebatur historiis. Narrabat vero, ut erat jocundissimus, nunc sua, nunc aliorum, quae vel vidisset vel didicisset gesta virorum fortium, aliquotiens usque ad noctis medium…* ("Readings were from books from the Fathers in original: or sometimes something taken from Church History. Truly, he would tell stories – because he was a most agreeable man – now about his own deeds, now about the deeds of other great men, things he had seen or heard about – until the middle of the night"). See also PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, p. 13; H. GLASER, "Wilhelm von Saint-Denis: Ein Humanist aus der Umgebung des Abtes Suger und die Krise seiner Abtei von 1151-1153", in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 85, 1965, p. 257-322.

[19] Similarly, an *emmanuensis* might keep notes during the oral performance of a sermon –notes from which a written text might later be prepared.

[20] PANOFSKY, *Abbot Suger*, p. 141-145; Philippe VERDIER, "Some New Readings of Suger's Writings", in *Abbot Suger*, p. 159-162, and Martin PICKAVÉ, "Zum lateinischen Text von *De consecratione*", in *Abt Suger von Saint-Denis: Ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 147-160.

The frequent use of the first person and preoccupation with personal salvation lends to the abbot's writing the quality of a confession; as Robert Hanning concluded, "I see Suger engaged in a lifelong attempt … to objectify his perceptions and desires by consciously manipulating the uniquely significant environment of which he found himself the custodian as abbot of Saint-Denis". [21] The three-part "event unit" provided a device that resembled classic dialectic, but where the thesis-antithesis-synthesis dynamic was manipulated for the purposes of persuasion. This manipulated "dialectic", applied to the production of rhetoric, architecture and personal salvation, in the end, left the abbot with a muddle in the middle.

Architecturally and soteriologically the abbot was preoccupied with the connection of a beginning and an end with a safe middle. In his rhetoric we have seen that the middle part of each "event unit" was the representation of the abbot's "justifiable" intervention to correct a pressing problem. We might say that the abbot considered that means were justified by ends – such manipulation coupled with the power of the text also characterized Suger's manufacture of written evidence to consolidate holdings of land and other possessions and to document the status of the monastery as premier ecclesiastical establishment in Gaul, burial place of the Apostles, chosen seat of the kings of France. [22]

A normal dialectical understanding of the business of construction would, I propose, posit the existing edifice as "thesis": attendant problems would be the "antithesis"; intervention and the production of the new edifice would be the working out process or synthesis. Suger's rhetoric of persuasion runs together thesis and antithesis into a premise of overwhelming pressing need. While it is possible to manipulate the rhetorical representation of truth in such modified dialectic, reality seems to have caught up with the abbot in his last years, with the monastic community disaffected as a result of profligate spending on the architectural reconstruction and the crusade.[23] The abbot faced death with an overwhelming sense of his own sins and failures. The same sense of disaffection and awareness of the dangers of manipulated "reasoning" attended us in 2007 after four years of senseless muddle in Iraq.[24]

After a decade of intense work the church of Saint-Denis remained in a most unsatisfactory state: more like three buildings than one. The glittering refurbished nave with its elegant columns spoke the language of *romanitas,* miraculously taking the visitor back to the early Christian and Merovingian past.[25] What an extraordinary contrast with the new western frontispiece! Lavishly sculptured interior spaces are here articulated with multiple colonnettes and new-fangled ribbed vaults speaking an entirely different language associated with the cultural flowering of the North. In the actual dialectic of the building the *romanitas* of the nave was countered by *modernitas* in the west end.[26]

The chevet, then, spoke a novel synthesizing language resulting from the programme of reality manipulation associated with the glorification of the saints which demanded an extraordinary space. With its crown of seven shallow chapels and double ambulatory encircling the old apse, sitting

[21] Robert Hanning, "Suger's Literary Style and Vision", in *Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis*, ed. Paula Gerson, p. 145-150. Hanning commented that Suger's literary style was quite different from that of any other learned abbots including Peter the Venerable, Bernard of Clairvaux and William of Saint-Thierry.

[22] Spiegel, *The Past as Text*, p. 156; Anne Lombard-Jourdan, *"Montjoie et Saint Denis!" Le centre de la Gaule aux origines de Paris et de Saint-Denis*, Paris, 1989; Jens Peter Clausen, "Suger, faussaire des chartes", in *Suger en question: Regards croisés sur Saint-Denis,* ed. Rolf Grosse, Munich, 2004, p. 109-116.

[23] Glaser, "Wilhelm von Saint-Denis", esp. p. 305; Grant, *Abbot Suger*, p. 206-207, 288; Rudolph, *Things of Greater Importance,* p. 31.

[24] Al Gore, *The Assault on Reason*, London, 2006.

[25] Suger described the nave as *opus antiquum*; his visits to Italy allowed him to recognize a visual community including Saint Peters, San Clemente and Monte Cassino where renovation projected Gregorian reform.

[26] Suger attempted to mitigate the visual clash between thesis and antithesis through the rhetoric of continuity: the old church has also possessed twin towers "neither high nor very sturdy but threatening ruin". The abbot was amongst the first to use the word *modernitas.*

atop the extended crypt, the new space provided a spectacular platform, elevated and brilliantly lit, for the shrine of the Apostles.

Art historians have seen the process of Gothic construction as applied dialectic without paying enough attention to the way that the patron might "speak the building".[27] I would suggest that just as in his rhetoric the abbot projected the end before the middle had been realized, so the dynamic "development" of Gothic was not, in fact, the result of careful and extended trial and error: the ends were envisaged and spoken before the means to realize them were fully realized. This concept is particularly important in the context of a construction project – the chevet of Saint-Denis – which pushed the limits of contemporary expertise. That the chevet failed within a century of its construction (it was rebuilt after 1231) suggests that unexpected structural problems were encountered resulting perhaps from the deployment of experimental forms – the light-filled elevated relic lantern may have embodied early flying buttresses or spurs sitting atop the transverse arches like Saint-Martin-des-Champs.[28]

I have already proposed that the choir of Notre-Dame of Paris, just over a decade later, had flying buttresses.[29] Such ambitious architectural programmes were an expression of endemic rivalry between the metropolitan cathedral and the royal abbey. The technological breakthroughs of Gothic architecture were not only the result of trial and error: careful reconciliation of thesis and antithesis in an "inevitable" forward movement. The architectural forms of the church of Saint-Denis were in part at least the product of a creative forum dominated by an abbot who pushed impetuously towards the end before appropriate means had been fully put in place: one who "spoke" the building before he saw it.

[27] In Anselm's *Monologion* God *spoke* the world. For a dialectical approach to the production of Gothic see Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, New York, 1958; Charles Radding & William Clark , *Medieval Architecture, Medieval Learning: Builders and Masters in the Age of Romanesque and Gothic*, New Haven, 1992.

[28] In January 1143 the "principal arches, turned separately, not yet held together by the bulk of the vaults" were shaken by a violent wind – the arches may have been flyers exposed to the violence of the wind around the exterior of the chevet. Scholars who have proposed flying buttresses include Christopher Wilson, *The Gothic Cathedral: The Architecture of the Great Church, 1130-1530,* London, 1992; Kenneth Conant , "Edifices marquants dans l'ambiance de Pierre le Vénérable et Pierre Abélard", in *Pierre Abélard, Pierre le Vénérable: Les courants philosophiques, littéraires et artistiques en Occident au milieu du XIIe siècle,* ed. René Louis et al., Paris, 1975; David J. Stanley, "The Original Buttressing of Abbot Suger's Chevet at the Abbey of Saint-Denis", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians,* 63, 2006, p. 334-355. Reservations have been expressed by Gabriele Annas & Günther Binding, "Arcus Superiores: Abt Suger von Saint-Denis und das gotische Kreuzrippengewölbe", in *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch*, 50, 1989, p. 7-24; Günther Binding, "Beiträge zum Architektur-Verständnis bei Abt Suger von Saint-Denis", in *Mittelalterliches Künstlerleben,* p. 184-207. Most recently see Andrew J. Tallon, *Experiments in Early Gothic Structure: The Flying Buttress*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Columbia University, New York, 2007.

[29] Stephen Murray, "Notre-Dame of Paris and the Anticipation of Gothic", in *Art Bulletin,* 80, 1998, p. 229-253.

“Fitting to the Requirements of the Place”: The Franciscan Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine in Paris

Michael T. Davis

The portrait of Paris, sketched by Jean of Jandun in 1323, featured two churches, Notre-Dame and the Sainte-Chapelle: the cathedral shining “at the summit as the sun amid the stars”, the royal chapel appearing as “one of the most splendid chambers of Paradise”.[1] Likewise, late medieval painters used the lordly bulk of the cathedral towers, the elegant gable-festooned chapel, and their echoing rose windows to fashion an unmistakable skyline of the city that perfectly reflected both its political power and spiritual prestige.[2] These visual prospects of Paris remain familiar today as we aim our camera lenses from the same vantage points taken by the Limbourg Brothers or Jean Fouquet, and scholars continue to study the same two edifices that captivated Jean de Jandun seven centuries ago.[3] Certainly the attraction of Notre-Dame and the Sainte-Chapelle is due not only to their architectural charisma and multimedia opulence, but also to the fact of their survival. In the first third of the fifteenth century, Guillebert de Mets again singled out the cathedral and chapel for special notice, but his *Description de la ville de Paris et de l’excellence du royaume de France* listed nearly eighty additional ecclesiastical structures in the city and its faubourgs from the tiny parish church of Sainte-Marine on the Île-de-la-Cité to the “very beautiful and tall church” of the Collège des Bernardins on the Left Bank.[4]

One of the major victims of Paris’s incessant urban development was the Franciscan church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, demolished between 1795 and 1797 to make way for the new École de Médecine (Figs. 1, 2).[5] Building on a series of preceding investigations, this study concentrates on the dossier of graphic records to resurrect the building. I also want to consider the unique nature of the church and convent, at once the seat of a Provincial Minister of the Order, its principal *studium generale* and centre of theological instruction, and the product of the sustained patronage of Louis IX, as factors in

[1] Jean de Jandun, *Tractatus de laudibus Parisius*, in Antoine-Jean-Victor Le Roux de Lincy & Lazare-Maurice Tisserand, *Paris et ses historiens aux XIVe et XVe siècles*, Paris, 1867, p. 44-47.

[2] Notre-Dame and the Sainte-Chapelle were the tallest structures in medieval Paris, the cathedral towers rising 69 metres and the height of the roof 43 metres. The Sainte-Chapelle is 42.5 metres tall. Among the images starring the two buildings are: “The Meeting of the Magi” from the *Très Riches Heures* of the Duke de Berry (Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 65, fol. 51v); the “Entry of Isabeau of Bavaria into Paris” from Froissart’s *Chronicles* (London, British Library Harley 4379, fol. 3); and a page with Sainte-Geneviève in prayer from a fifteenth-century Book of Hours (Manchester, John Rylands University Library, MS late 164, fol. 254r). In Jean Fouquet’s *Hours of Étienne Chevalier* (Chantilly, Musée Condé) the Sainte-Chapelle is featured in the urban background of the “Way to Calvary”, while Notre-Dame, viewed from the east, rising behind the “Lamentation” and seen from the west, dominates the cityscape of the “Descent of the Holy Spirit” (New York, Metropolitan Museum, Lehman Collection, Inv. 1975.1.2490).

[3] Indeed, as Dieter Kimpel and Robert Suckale, *Die gotische Architektur in Frankreich 1130-1270*, Munich, 1985, p. 404, wrote, “The Sainte-Chapelle is the most important work of architecture of the mid-13th century and, along with Notre-Dame and the Cathedral of Chartres the most studied building of the Gothic”. Willibald Sauerländer, “Medieval Paris, Center of European Taste, Fame and Realities”, in *Paris, Center of Artistic Enlightenment*, ed. George Mauner et al., University Park, PA, 1988, p. 14-45, declares, “In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the fame of Paris as a city of the arts crystallized around Notre-Dame” (p. 18) and judges the Sainte-Chapelle “the most famous building erected during the reign of Saint Louis…”(p. 21). He furthermore writes, “European taste… became so French, so Parisian… in the second half of the thirteenth century under the spell of the ‘Sainte-Chapelle’ and the magnificent roses of Notre-Dame” (p. 22).

[4] For Guillebert de Mets, consult Le Roux de Lincy & Tisserand, *Paris et ses historiens*, p. 131-236. Wendy Pfeffer, “The Dit des Monstiers,” in *Speculum*, 73, 1998, p. 80-114, analyzes this poem, written around 1270 that lists 92 churches. Ten churches mentioned by Guillebert survive today.

[5] Laure Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent des Cordeliers de Paris: étude historique et archéologique du XIIIe siècle à nos jours*, Paris, 1975, p. 330-332.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100145

Fig. 1 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, cloister and south side of church. Engraving by Fr. René Rocheran, 1656/1673 (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Va 267a)

Fig. 2 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, view east of interior of church during demolition circa 1795 by Pierre-Antoine Demachy (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Rés. Ve 53 d II, no. 1, 287)

shaping its architectural programme.[6] These multiple roles seem to materialize in a structure of striking simplicity that sits on a great church ground plan with ambulatory and radiating chapels. Only by taking into account the particular confluence of the accidents of urban context, the pragmatics of function and the nature of patronage can the coherence as well as the “complexity and contradiction” of the design of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine be understood.[7] As Paul Crossley wrote in “Medieval Architecture and Meaning: the Limits of Iconography”, “the character of the gothic cathedral (in this case, the mendicant church), the sources of its totality, cannot be traced back to some single ‘intention’… heaped up from untidy masses of stone… (they) speak to us of truths ramified, disruptive and many layered”.[8]

Building on the left bank

After first settling at Saint-Denis in 1217, the Franciscans established a new house in 1223 at Vauvert just outside the Paris city walls to the south.[9] Papal approval in 1224 of the right to have an oratory with a portable altar may have cleared the way for the construction of the infamous “long and high” church that “many brothers saw as incompatible with the Order’s statute of poverty. And they begged the blessed Francis to destroy it”.[10] This structure collapsed – whether by divine intervention or architectural miscalculation – in 1228 or 1229.[11] But thanks to the intervention of Louis IX, who

[6] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, remains the most detailed study of the Paris Franciscans. But see the important corrections offered by Jérôme Poulenc, “Une Histoire du Grand Couvent des Cordeliers de Paris des origines à nos jours”, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 69, 1976, p. 474-495. Francesca Picou, “Églises et couvents de Frères Mineurs en France: receuil de plans”, in *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques*, n. S., 17-18, 1984, p. 115-176, esp. p. 165-166; and Wolfgang Schenkluhn, *Ordines Studentes: Aspekte zur Kirchenarchitektur der Dominikaner und Franziskaner im 13. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1985, p. 76-84; *ibidem*, *Architektur der Bettelorden: Die Baukunst der Dominikaner und Franziskaner in Europa*, Darmstadt, 2000, p. 71-72, 160-161, have discussed the church within the context of Franciscan and Mendicant architecture. Adolphe Berty & Lazare-Maurice Tisserand, *Topographie historique du vieux Paris, 5: Région occidentale de l’Université*, Paris, 1887, p. 333-356; Yvan Christ, *Églises parisiennes actuelles et disparues*, Paris, 1947, p. 33; and Philippe Lorentz & Dany Sandron, *Atlas de Paris au Moyen Âge*, Paris, 2006, p. 145-147, treat Sainte-Marie-Madeleine within the general context of Paris. The remarks of Robert Branner, *Saint Louis and the Court Style in Gothic Architecture*, London, 1965, p. 117 on the church are misleading. See also Markus Schlicht, “Un ‘Scandale’ architectural vers 1300 – l’intervention de Philippe le Bel dans les choix formels de l’architecture de Saint-Louis de Poissy”, in *Hofkultur in Frankreich und Europa im Spätmittelalter/La Culture de cour en France et en Europe à la fin du Moyen Âge*, ed. Christian Freigang & Jean-Claude Schmitt, Berlin, 2005, p. 302, who sets the church of the Cordeliers within the framework of royal architectural projects.

[7] This notion, of course, is inspired by Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, New York, 1977, p. 16. Venturi’s statement, “I am for richness or meaning rather than clarity of meaning; for the implicit function as well as the explicit function. I prefer ‘both-and’” to “‘either-or’… A valid architecture evokes many levels of meaning and combinations of focus: its space and its elements become readable and workable in several ways at once” is especially cogent to my perspective on the Franciscan church.

[8] Paul Crossley, “Medieval Architecture and Meaning: the Limits of Iconography”, in *The Burlington Magazine*, 130, 1988, p. 121.

[9] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 6-19, for the arrival and early years of the Franciscan community in Paris. Vauvert was the site of the later Luxembourg Gardens.

[10] Thomas of Eccleston, *Tractatus de adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. Andrew G. Little, Manchester, 1951, p. 47: *Aedificabant tunc temporis locum, qui appellatur Valvert, in quo domum longam et altam construxerant, quae multis fratibus videbatur esse contra statum paupertatis ordinis. Unde et beato Francisco supplicabant aliqui, et praecipue frater Angeler, ut eam destrueret*. See also Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 13-14.

[11] According to Thomas of Eccleston, *Tractatus de adventu*, p. 47, the entire roof and walls of the newly completed structure collapsed (*Et ecce, cum fratres eam ingredi debuissent, dispositione divina nullus in ea extitit, cum usque ad tabulatum totum tectum cum parietibus corruit… .*), which may indicate that the Vauvert church was vaulted. Interestingly, the vaults of S. Francesco in Bologna also collapsed in 1254, for which see Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden*, p. 72.

brokered a deal with the abbot of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, the thirty friars of the community were relocated inside the city walls on the Left Bank near the Porte Gibard in 1230.[12] With the continuing aid of the king, the bishop of Paris, Guillaume d'Auvergne, and Pope Gregory IX the rest of the decade was spent in assembling a site for the rapidly growing community. However, the concessions of Saint-Germain-des-Prés came with strings attached: the friars were not permitted to have "bells, nor a cemetery, neither a consecrated altar, nor a portable one, nor a consecrated chapel."[13] These restrictions were lifted in 1240 and thus opened the way for the erection of a monumental church ringed by a necklace of two dozen chapels.[14]

Documentary footholds that might anchor a building chronology are, at best, indirect and circumstantial. The *Grandes Chroniques de France* reports that Louis IX directed part of the 10,000 pound fine imposed on Enguerrand IV de Coucy for hanging three Flemish youths caught hunting on his lands "to make the convent of the Friars Minor of Paris" and he is consistently cast as principal donor to the construction.[15] However, Enguerrand was only tried in 1259, and, beyond Louis's assistance in assembling and buying the convent's land, the king's documented generosity took the form of gifts of relics, books, and windows; 400 pounds were bequeathed to the Franciscans in his will of 1270.[16] In fact, during the 1240s, a period when Louis was focused, first, on the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle and after 1244 in preparation for the crusade, he disappears from records relevant to the convent project.[17]

[12] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 233-235; Berty & Tisserand, *Topographie historique*, p. 334. Initially, the land of the new site was only lent to the friars. In 1234, Louis IX bought the land, which may have included a large residence (*porprisium*), for the Franciscans from Saint-Germain-des-Prés.

[13] The 1230 concession stipulated that the Parisian friars *nec ibi poterunt habere campanas, nec cimiterium, nec altare sacratum, nisi portatile, nec capellam sacratam…* .

[14] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 45, 250, for the 1240 measures. Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden*, p. 71, suggests that the church was already under way in 1236 and also cites the report that Alexander de Hales, who died in 1245, was buried in the nave, presumably of the new structure. The three bulls issued by Gregory IX in 1236 allowed the Franciscans to acquire land to enlarge their compound on both sides of the city walls, but do not mention the construction of a church. Beaumont-Maillet points out that Hales's tomb was marked by a seventeenth-century monument and he was "very likely" initially buried elsewhere in the convent. See Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 235-236, 253, n.18.

[15] "Le roy ne voult point qu'il [the money from the Coucy fine] demourassent en son trésor, ançois en fist fair la maison Dieu de Pontoise, et la multiplia en rentes et en terres, et si en fist faire le dortoir aux Frères Prescheurs de Paris; et du remenant fist fair le moustier aux Frères Meneurs de Paris.", in *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*, ed. Paulin Paris, Paris, 1838, vol. 4, p. 352-353. Guillaume de Nangis, claims that Louis built the church of the Friars Minor "from the foundations to completion". For the trial and fine of Enguerrand de Coucy, Edmond Faral, "Le Procès d'Enguerrand IV de Coucy", in *Revue historique de droit français et l'étranger*, 26, 1948, p. 213-225, here p. 242-243 for the king's use of the money on architectural projects. Enguerrand also paid 12,000 pounds parisis to redeem his obligation to join the Crusade. Among recent scholars who view Louis as the patron of the Franciscan church, see M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, Ithaca, NY, 2008, p. 155

[16] The money from Enguerrand's fine appears to have been paid only in 1261 as discussed by Faral, "Le Procès", p. 242-243. For Louis's gifts to the Franciscans, Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 38-39. According to Jacques Du Breul, *Théâtre des antiquitez de Paris*, Paris, 1639, p. 402, quoted by Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 289-290, a window in the chapel of the Saint-Sépulcre, located in the seventh bay of the south side of the nave, was decorated with borders with fleur de lys and Castile castles (The glass, "estoit sans histoires et images, faite comme celles que l'on voit es chapelles de derrière le choeur, faites à demy lozanges peintes et damassées de noir par dessus aux bordures de fleur de lys et de chasteaux d'or sur du rouge, qui monstrent qu'elles y avoient esté mises du temps de S. Louys et Madame Blanche de Castille, sa mere."). It is unclear if the passage intends to suggest that the choir chapels also contained similar borders.

[17] Branner, *Saint Louis*, p. 86; and William Chester Jordan, *Louis IX and the Challenge of the Crusade: A Study in Rulership*, Princeton, 1979, p. 90-93 have drawn attention to the slowdown in royal building activities in the later 1240s. However the king's absence from 1248 to 1254 need not have stopped construction of the Franciscan church as proposed by Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 252. Until her death in 1252, Blanche of Castile acted as regent and the government continued to function.

A more credible index of the completion of substantial work comes in the form of two bulls issued by Alexander IV in June 1256 in favour of the faithful who attended offices, sermons, or confessions in the church.[18] As Jérôme Poulenc remarked, these measures paint a clear picture of "an edifice already open to the public and outfitted inside to fulfill its pastoral obligations".[19] Clearly the choir was in use by 1256 and the royal laundering of the Coucy blood money seems likely to have underwritten a final burst of work on the nave.[20] In 1262, Urban IV, "enthusiastically praised the king of France because he built the new church of the Friars Minor of Paris from scratch and not without great expense", and accorded an indulgence of three years and forty days for those who visited the day of its consecration or in the four months following. That dedication, attended by "an incredible throng of people", took place on 6 June 1263.[21]

In sum, the written records combine to indicate that the Franciscan church, begun shortly after 1240, was liturgically operative in the mid-1250s, and complete by 1263. It then becomes the exact contemporary of the Sainte-Chapelle, the Virgin chapel at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and the eastern nave chapels of Notre-Dame. And despite the king's sustained aid, the Franciscan convent of Paris was not, strictly speaking, a royal foundation in the same way as Royaumont or Maubuisson. Although Louis IX threw his considerable administrative clout and financial resources behind this major project of a favoured religious order, there is no hint that he was involved in setting the architectural agenda or demanded particular features.[22] The question then remains: what kind of building was Sainte-Marie-Madeleine?

The fire

In resurrecting the thirteenth-century church, one must sift through the stratum of extensive repairs following a ruinous fire of 19 November 1580. The choir was restored between 1581 and 1583,

[18] These two bulls have been published by P. Hugolinus Lippens, "Provinciae Franciae Chartularium aliaque documenta saec. XIII", in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 30, 1937, p. 57-59. The first, which accords an indulgence of forty days for "those who come to your place in Paris for worship and sermons" (*omnibus penitentibus et confessis, qui ad locum vestrum Parisiensem causa devotionis accesserint et predicationibus, que ibidem per vos et alios vestri Ordinis Fratres fient, curaverint interesse, singulis vicibus XL dies de iniunctis eis pentitentiis misericorditer relaxamus*) does not specify the church as the locus of the sermons. The second, however, does name the church as the destination of the faithful (*Hinc est quod ecclesiam vestram digna coli reverentia cupientes… qui ad eamdem ecclesiam in sanctorum Francisci, Antonii, ac beate Clare virginis festivitatibus et in VIIem diebus festivas ipsas immediate sequentibus pura devotione accesserint annuatim… unum annum et XL die de iniuncta eis penitentia misericorditer relaxamus.*)

[19] Poulenc, "Une Histoire du Grand Couvent", p. 493-494.

[20] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 253, dates the construction of the nave after 1269, while Poulenc, "Une Histoire du Grand Couvent", p. 495, dates building activity between 1259 and 1263.

[21] The consecration is often erroneously dated to 1262, presumably based on Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga, *De Origine seraphicae religionis franciscanae*, Paris, 1587, p. 117-118, cited by Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 252, n. 10, who in fact writes that was "around" (*circa*) 1262 in the second year of his pontificate that Urban IV issued the indulgences. The passage from Gonzaga relating these events is as follows: *Hoc autem circa annum a Christo nato 1262 contigisse idcirco existimaverim, quod Urbanus IV anno sui pontificatus II diplomate dato in Veteri urbe ipsum regem Francorum laudat vehementer quod in domo Fratrum Minorum Parisiensium de novo nec sine magnis sumptibus ecclesiam cconstruxerit, in cuius dedicatione indulgentius dari postularet… . Sedente itaque in cathedra B. Petri Urbano IV et Francis imperante D. Ludovico Franciscanorum Parisiensium templum solemni ritu ac incredibili populorum frequentia Deo opt. max. in memoriam B. Mariae Magdalene VIII idus junii consecratum et dedicatum est.* Poulenc, "Une Histoire du Grand Couvent", p. 493, pointed out the correct date of the dedication. My thanks to Professor Kathleen Colemen of Harvard University for her help with the nuances of these Latin passages.

[22] Branner, *Saint Louis*, p. 31, makes a similar point about Louis's involvement with the Victorine priory of Sainte-Cathérine-de-la-Couture. For a very different case of royal involvement in which the king imposed his architectural vision on a mendicant project, see Schlicht, "Un 'Scandale' architectural vers 1300", p. 291-325, esp. p. 302.

Fig. 3 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, view northwest into nave during demolition, circa 1795 by Pierre-Antoine Demachy (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Rés. Ve 53 d II, no. 1, 286)

while repairs on the nave tarried on until 1606.[23] Because pre-conflagration views, in the form of early city maps, consistently adopt a bird's eye view from the west, only the three vessels with their distinctive longitudinal roofs are visible, and this has led some scholars to suggest that the ambulatory and radiating chapels were added during the campaign of repairs or declare that the thirteenth-century design is irretrievable.[24] However, late sixteenth-century documents contain no mention of such sub-

[23] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 255-259, for an account of the fire and subsequent repairs, which began with the rebuilding of the wooden roofs over the choir and chapels as well as the fabrication of thirty-nine windows in the nave and choir; and p. 441-445 for the documents of the restoration.

[24] Branner, *Saint Louis*, p. 117, proposed that the plan of the church of the Franciscans probably resembled Orly or Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas with a continuous polygonal eastern wall enclosing a series of trapezoidal ambulatory chapels. This is essentially followed by Panayota Volti, *Les Couvents des ordres mendiants et leur environnement à la fin du Moyen Âge*, Paris, 2003, p. 253-254, who concludes that the chapels were completely rebuilt in the sixteenth century. Agnès Bos, *Les Églises flamboyantes de Paris*, Paris, 2003, p. 303, cites a document of 1501 that refers to a mention of "certaines chapelles neufves estans derrière le cueur de l'église des Cordeliers" as pointing to their later addition.

stantial additions; to the contrary, they strongly suggest that the master masons were charged with what amounted to a restoration of the fabric. Although a stoa of Doric supports replaced the thirteenth-century columns (Fig. 2), wherever possible old stones were re-used and even details, such as tracery mullions or the molded corbel table that carried the gutter between the roofs, were reproduced from the same *liais de Paris* stone as the original structure.[25]

Pierre-Antoine Demachy's renderings of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine during demolition record substantial surviving sections of the medieval building. A view northwest from the choir looking into the nave past donkey carts and heaps of architectural detritus figures Gothic columns, surmounted by bell-shaped foliate capitals and hexagonal abaci, attached to the lateral walls of the chapels (Fig. 3). Further, Gaignères' drawings of the tombs of Charles d'Étampes (died 1336), "behind the high altar to the right", and Pierre Filhol (died 1540), "at the enclosure behind the choir", situate the monuments between similar free-standing supports of the main vessel arcade indicating that a continuous aisle circled the choir (Fig. 4).[26] Finally, burials of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries *in* the chapels around the choir and another Gaignières drawing that places the tomb of Antoine de Longueil, bishop of Léon who died in 1500, *under* the window of the family chapel of Saint-Esprit, the first polygonal chapel on the south side of the ambulatory, clinch the argument that Sainte-Marie-Madeleine's original choir design indeed was based on a great church scheme with an ambulatory and radiating chapels.[27] The visual and documentary evidence sig-

Fig. 4 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, tomb of Charles d'Etampes behind main altar in hemicycle of choir, drawing from the collection of Roger de Gaignières (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Pe I, vol. 1, fol. 16)

[25] BEAUMONT-MAILLET, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 443-445 for the contract of 31 December 1599 for work in the nave. Typical of the provisions is one that concerns window tracery: "Se fera ausy le remplaiges desd. vitres de pareilles façon et en telle quantyté que celles qui sont à present faites de pierre de lyez entire de Notre-Dame-des-Champs, y faisent reservir ausy les vieilles pierres qui se trouveront estre bonnes et entyeres de lad. demollysion".

[26] For Pierre Filhol's tomb (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Ms. lat. 17021, fol. 90) located "a la closture derriere le chœur," see Jean ADHÉMAR, "Les Tombeaux de la collection Gaignières: dessins d'archéologie du XVIIe siècle", in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, ser. 6, 88, 1976, p. 86, no. 1583. BEAUMONT-MAILLET, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 311-12, 388, situates the tomb in the chapel of Sainte-Catherine or the Onze-mille-vierges right behind the high altar. Oddly enough the drawing of Filhol's tomb includes three-shaft vault responds ascending the wall from atop the arcade capitals. This would seem to be a mistake on the part of the draughtsman.

[27] The Gaignères drawing of the Longueil tomb (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Rés. Pe 11a, fol. 216, and Ms. lat 17026, fol. 57) is illustrated in BEAUMONT-MAILLET, *Le Grand Couvent*, pl. XXIII, fig. 26; see also ADHÉMAR, "Les Tombeaux", p. 47, no. 1352.

nal that the nave and upper parts of the structure bore the brunt of the fire that is reported to have been started by burning candles at the choir screen and fed by the timber ceiling.[28]

The functionalist plan

A first inspection of the plan of the plan of the Cordeliers might lead to the conclusion that its design perfectly embodies both the aristocratic and mendicant strands of its patronage (Fig. 5). Stretching about 96 metres in length, the seventeen straight bays of the monumental basilica terminated in a hemicycle "en rond point".[29] Théodore Vacquer's plan estimated that a pair of aisles, 3.20 metres wide, and a continuous suite of chapels, 3.40 metres deep, flanked the 9.60 metre main vessel of the choir, while the eight bays of the nave followed a simplified three-aisled layout.[30]

The master mason who laid out the plan – likely not Eudes de Montreuil as once proposed – used geometry in an unusually flexible manner to both maximize and integrate the parts of his building.[31] Thus, the straight line of the arcade piers was extended as far east as possible; the five ambulatory chapels, 5.4 metres at the mouth and about 4 metres deep, were formed by radiating walls disposed on a hexagonal arrangement and outer walls of octagonal plan, a strategy that created a subtle spatial expansion within each chapel. Finally, a hybrid polygonal-rectangular pair of chapels *may* have effected the transition between the curving and straight bays, forming a unit whose closest parallel is the chapel at the end of the outer choir aisle at Troyes Cathedral.[32] As a whole, the plan is unique among Franciscan churches and joins a small cohort of elite houses in the Order, S. Francesco in Bologna, S. Antonio in Padua, and S. Lorenzo in Naples, that adopted the ambulatory and radiating chapel configuration.[33] Perhaps, the size and uncharacteristically complex plan of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine responded to the importance of its role as *studium generale* of the Order and sizable community by embracing a great church model to advertise the Franciscans' pre-eminence among the monastic communities in Paris, aimed in particular at the Dominicans a few blocks away.[34] Whatever semiotics of rank or morphology of prestige may inhere in the plan, its design offered an eminently pragmatic solution to both physical and functional reality.

[28] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 255-256. The medieval wooden choir screen was replaced by the classical style jubé that appears in the Demachy rendering (Fig. 2).

[29] *Ibidem*, p. 259, citing Gonzaga, who reports that the church was more than 320 feet in length and 90 feet wide, estimates the length at around 105 metres. The plan reconstituted by Vacquer, Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS 252, no. 97 and Papiers Vacquer D11643; also Paris, Musée Carnavalet, Estampes, Topogr. 106, measures the church at around 96 metres in length including the exterior walls.

[30] Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, Papiers Vacquer D11643. Walls were estimated at one metre thick, thus the entire width of the choir would have been approximately 24.80 metres.

[31] For the debate surrounding Eudes de Montreuil's mythical involvement with the Franciscan church, see Branner, *Saint Louis*, p. 117, n. 17; and Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 254-255, 387. The master mason, who died in 1289, was buried in the nave of the church.

[32] Thédore Vacquer's draft of the plan, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS 252, no. 97 and Papiers Vacquer D11643 waffles about the shape of this hybrid chapel. Pencil lines show that he considered a third polygonal side to connect the rear wall of the chapel to the lateral wall of its west side, but ultimately opted to extend the rear wall to align with the exterior walls of the chapels to the west. The watercolour by Antoine-Louis Goblain (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Rés. Ve d II no. 1, 288, here fig. 6) shows the south wall of the interior of this chapel, just east of the doorway of the passage leading to the sacristy, as a simple flat wall with a two-light window. A fragment of the adjacent wall remains along with the right jamb of a window. Although the orientation of this mural silver is uncertain, only a diagonal wall would permit a window open to the exterior and also explains the position of the window contiguous tot he south wall light. In a rectangular chapel, this window abutting the polygonal chapel to the east, would be blind.

[33] This group of special churches in the Order is discussed by Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden*, p. 71-81; also in the context of San Lorenzo in Naples by Caroline Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples*, New Haven, CT, 2004, p. 57-63.

[34] Schenkluhn, *Ordines Studentes*, p. 83.

Fig. 5 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, plan of church, redrawn after Thédore Vacquer, Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS 252, no. 97 and Papiers Vacquer D11643 (Michael T. Davis)

The first constraint to be negotiated was the site itself. The church ran hard along the rue des Cordeliers, a major artery of the Left Bank that connected the Porte Gibard (Porte Saint-Germain) with the rue de la Harpe, while the ensemble of claustral and conventual buildings was shoehorned into a triangular plot that abutted the walls of Philip Augustus. A projecting transept was simply not an option. And the slight jog south of the rue des Cordeliers, rather than a late and lackadaisical building campaign, created the irregular form of the nave.[35] Here, lateral chapels were eliminated as the aisles were enlarged to create a spacious three-vessel hall in which the public could assemble for "offices and sermons".

A second factor in generating the plan was the decision to wrap the choir in a corona of chapels. Besides accommodating the liturgical needs of the convent's resident community, the chapels may also have responded to contemporary circumstances unfolding from both the Franciscans' economic situation and their relation to the public.[36] That this precocious planning breakthrough occurred in Paris was no accident. Bishop Guillaume d'Auvergne (1228-1249), a consistent supporter of the Franciscans in the city during his pontificate, was one of the chief architects in formalizing the concept of Purga-

[35] Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 253, places the construction of the nave after 1269 when a parcel of land, the "Petit Champ" was annexed to the convent. But see Poulenc, "Une Histoire du Grand Couvent", p. 495 for a different view.

[36] For the clericalization of the Franciscans, Laurentio Landini, *The Causes of the Clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor, 1209-1260*, Chicago, 1968; Caroline Bruzelius, "The Dead Come to Town: Preaching, Burying, and Building in the Mendicant Orders", in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New Architecture*, ed. Alexandra Gajewski & Zoë Opačić (Architectura Medii Aevi, I), Turnhout, 2007, p. 212.

[37] See Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 17, 45, for Guillaume d'Auvergne's support of the Franciscans. Mailan S. Doquong , *Rayonnant Chapels in Context*, unpublished doctoral thesis, New York University, 2009, p. 79-83, emphasizes the bishop's role as prime mover behind the addition of the Notre-Dame chapels. Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Chicago, 1984, p. 241-245, discusses his concept of Purgatory.

tory in which the intercession of the living on behalf of the dead through memorial masses sparked an industry of chapel construction.[37] Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, conceived from the outset with spaces available for lay burial, appears to be one of the earliest examples to follow the lead of the cathedral where chantry chapels were retrofitted in the nave beginning around 1230. Economically, these adjuncts offered valuable additional sources of revenue through foundations and donations that would have ameliorated the habitually straitened finances of the convent.[38] In sum, the plan of the Franciscan church arose out of lucid consideration of urban and practical factors that used up-to-date strategies to organize a set of hierarchical spaces serving the friars in the choir, the lay public in the nave, and the souls of the remembered dead in the chapels.

Resurrecting the elevation

Scanning the interior of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine transports us into a surprisingly different architectural sphere (Figs 2, 3). Rather than an overtly modern structure composed of networks of finely scaled shafts and intricate mouldings, as the plan would have us believe, we encounter an elevation composed of a column-supported arcade and an unarticulated clerestory zone capped by a wooden barrel vault.[39] A continuous corbelled stringcourse seems to have belted the main vessel serving as a sill for the clerestory and dividing the wall into two approximately equal stories.[40] By 1240, the two-story elevation was well established among the Cistercians, as at Pontigny or Ourscamp, offering the Franciscans an appropriate model that rejected an obvious expression of height.[41] But the Parisian Cordeliers went even further, for the decision to timber vault the interior, allowed them to delete respond shafts and capitals, formerets, ribs, and keystones. Light stone diaphragm arches carried the aisle vaults (Fig. 3). Because an elaborate buttressing system was unnecessary, the walls both inside and out could be built as planar membranes stiffened only by the slightly projecting salients of the chapels. Simple foliate capitals and traceried windows struck the only decorative notes of the interior. Although patterns are not rendered precisely in views of the church, the choir chapel windows appear to have been adorned by a pair of lancets topped by an unframed quatrefoil (Fig. 6), while an unassuming three-light pattern, widely found, for example, in a window of the *studium* building of the

[38] For the economic importance of chapels in mendicant churches, Bruzelius, "The Dead Come to Town", p. 203-224. David Gillerman, "S. Fortunato in Todi: Why the Hall Church?", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 48, 1989, p. 171, points to "a combination of economic and religious reasons" for the inclusion of subsidiary chapels at Todi and other friaries. See Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 32-35, for the resources of the convent. She also compiles a list of 956 burials at the church and cloister of the convent (p. 363-432), which she acknowledges "is not complete".

[39] Schenkluhn, *Ordines Studentes*, 76-84, and 114-163, recognized this disparity in his interpretation of the plan as a distinguishing trait of Franciscan *studia*, while the wooden vaulted interior, by turning away from the complex apparatus of *Kathedralgotik*, communicated the Order's humility.

[40] The visual evidence for this stringcourse is ambiguous as can be seen in Figs 2 and 3. It is clearly shown in Demachy's view east toward the jubé and choir, but eliminated in his gouache looking northwest into the nave. It may be referred to in the 1599 document concerning repairs to the nave, as published by Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 444: "Se faict ausy en levant lesd. pans de murs au dessus desd. ars doubleaux les deulx assiz rondes en forme d'encorbellement en pareille sailye haulxtour et de pareille pierre dure que celles qui sont a present pour porter les dalles en façon des canaulx pour servir et resepvoir les eaulx d'entre le grand et petit comble des bas-cotez… ."

[41] For the elimination of the triforium, Pierre Héliot, "La Suppression du triforium au début de la période gothique", in *Revue archéologique*, 1, 1964, p. 130-150; see Peter Fergusson, *The Architecture of Solitude: Cistercian Abbeys in Twelfth-Century England*, Princeton, 1984, p. 36, 52-53, 65, 96, 119 for the two-story elevation in Cistercian architecture; and Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples*, p. 57, for the debate on the relation of S. Lorenzo with French Cistercian prototypes.

[42] The engraving by René Rocheran (Fig. 1) shows three unit patterns along the south side of the church. Because of the tighter intercolumniation the clerestory of the hemicycle, presumably, would have been reduced to two lights. The details of the aisle and chapel tracery visible above the aisle roof are less legible, but seem to depict similar triplets

Fig. 6 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, view of remains of chapel, south side of choir and refectory circa 1800, watercolor by Antoine-Louis Goblain (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Estampes, Rés. Ve 53 d II no. 1, 288)

Collège des Bernardins, in the ambulatory clerestory at Le Mans Cathedral, and at Saint-Jean, Sens, embellished the nave aisles and upper windows (Fig. 1).[42] This raises the possibility that not only were the choir and nave physically separated by the choir screen, but also that they were distinguished by deliberate formal differences.

Vertical dimensions of the church are not reported. Nevertheless, by combining Vacquer's measurements, Demachy's views, and Gaignières's tomb drawings, we can estimate that the columns were about 5.5 metres tall and the stringcourse above the arcade was set at around 8.5 metres. With the clerestory leveld slightly shorter than the arcade, the top of the wall reached about 15 to 16 metres and 18 to 20 metres to the crown of the ceiling.[43]

in the nave, which would accord with single window visible in the south aisle in the Demachy sepia. The Gaignières drawings of the choir windows (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Estampes, collection Gaignières, Oa 17, fol. 26 ff.), comprise an ensemble of two- and three-lancet patterns, but in concentrating on their aristocratic subjects do not depict the apex of the pattern. My reconstruction of a two-light design in the choir chapels is based on the Goblain watercolour as in n. 32 above. A similar distinction in tracery design between the apse and straight bays is found in the contemporary Dominican church of Notre-Dame at Louvain. See Thomas COOMANS and Anna BERGMANS, "L'Église Notre-Dame des Dominicains à Louvain (1251-1276): Le mémorial d'Henri III, duc de Brabant, et d'Alix de Bourgogne," in *Bulletin monumental*, 167, 2009, p. 99-125.

[43] By applying Vacquer's 4.80 metre bay length to the Gaignières tomb drawings I have estimated the height of the arcade columns and arches. The dimensions of the upper half of the elevation have been determined from Demachy's renderings. In any case, the height of the church would accord with that of the refectory, which rises 24.25 metres to the apex of the roof and appears consistent with the representation of the two structures.

Frames of reference

In considering the sources and significance of the elevation design, I want to turn away from the usual typological quest to approach the question from the perspective of receptive response and association. The extreme simplicity of the interior led Wolfgang Schenkluhn to connect Sainte-Marie-Madeleine with the pragmatic architecture of secular halls and hospitals.[44] But the borders between building types are indeed porous and their semiotic charge ambiguous: remember that wooden ceilings covered the naves of elite monasteries such as Saint-Germain-des-Prés and Saint-Martin-des-Champs or later the chapel of the royal Collège de Navarre, while the great halls of the royal palaces were hardly intended to communicate humility.

To a greater degree than its near-contemporaries in Bologna, Padua, or Naples, the church of the Cordeliers in Paris bears a striking resemblance to an early Christian basilica; only the subtly pointed arches and tracery patterns betray its thirteenth-century date (Figs 1, 2).[45] That this evocative retrospection was a conscious decision is born out by comparison to the forms of the adjacent sacristy and chapter house. Both spaces were stone-vaulted. Further, the chapter house opened into the east walk of the cloister through an arcade whose piers, with their elision of support and span, prismatic mouldings and absence of capitals, anticipate late Gothic developments by well over a century (Fig. 7).[46] The planners and builders of the church did not assemble their edifice from a basic kit of columns, walls, windows, and a timber roof because of a lack of skill or options; rather, I would argue, they aimed to materialize the character and architectural ideals of the Order that would soon be articulated in legislation and the writings of its leaders.

To the residents of the convent, the church may have evoked the Franciscans' emphatic connections to Rome and the pope.[47] It is also useful to keep in mind that the community of friars and students were an international body drawn from all parts of Europe, thus their architectural frame of reference would have been exceptionally diverse. Unlike their neighbours and rivals the Dominicans, whose church truly resembled a hall, the Franciscans visibly embraced an ecclesiastical typology, yet one that was stripped of dramatic and ornamental accretions to return to an essential statement of the church structure. It is perhaps not too much to suggest that the architectural attitudes of Bonaventure, expressed in the statutes of 1260 and complemented by his encyclical letters as Minister General, were fundamentally shaped by his experience in Paris between 1242 and 1257. As a young student and later as a professor at the University, he would have seen the construction of a building that "strictly avoided the exquisite craftsmanship and superfluity [that] are directly contrary to poverty… whether in pictures, sculptures, windows, columns and suchlike… ".[48] In addition, Sainte-Marie-Madeleine's ability to accommodate the varied functional needs of friars and public "fitting to the requirements of the place", may inform Bonaventure's lament that many of "the residences of the brothers are being changed frequently and at great expense, often impetuously and with considerable disturbance to the surrounding territory. This denotes capriciousness and compromises our poverty".[49] Rather than the episodic

44 Schenkluhn, *Ordines Studentes*, p. 83.

45 Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden*, p. 27-31, draws attention to the resemblance of the Dominican church of Saint-Jacques in Paris to such early Christian houses as S. Eustorgio in Milan and Sta. Sabina in Rome that had been taken into the Order.

46 Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 312-315, for a description of the sacristy. Invaluable drawings and notes of the sacristy, chapter house, and cloister are to be found in the Papiers Vacquer, Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS 232.

47 John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517*, Oxford, 1968, p. 84, 120-121, 295-314.

48 This excerpt from the statutes of 1260 is quoted from Wolfgang Braunfels, *Monasteries of Western Europe: The Architecture of the Orders*, Princeton, 1972, p. 246.

49 For a discussion of Bonaventure's encyclicals and architectural views, Bruzelius, "The Dead Come to Town", p. 213-216. This passage is taken from Bonaventure's first encyclical letter of 1257.

construction and *ad hoc* process of expansion and growth that frequently marked the Order's early architectural initiatives, the Paris church remained essentially unchanged during its five and a half centuries of life.

It is doubtful that the Parisian laity would have seen the church with the same eyes as the Franciscans. Instead of a network of associations that linked Paris with Rome, the present with the early Christian past, the friars with the apostles, a different and local nexus of references would have been in play. While the columned basilica may not have conjured up the Lateran or Santa Sabina in Rome in the mind of the "average viewer", it would have offered a familiar variant of parish churches in the city, such as the Holy Innocents, Saint-Séverin, or Saint-Pierre-aux-Bœufs.[50] He may even have noticed the Cordeliers' elimination of the triforium, featured in the larger churches, reduced the height and complexity of the elevation to signal the admirable humility of its Franciscan occupants. The wholesale adoption of the two-storey elevation among late Gothic churches in Paris, usually accompanied by plans that included continuous suites of lateral chapels, suggests that the strengths of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine's unique design, at once practical, economical, and flexible, furnished an important model to builders of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[51]

Fig. 7 Paris, Church of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, drawing of arches at entrance to chapter house by Théodore Vacquer, Paris, Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris, MS 252, p. 57 (Photo Michael T. Davis, with the permission of the Bibliothèque historique de la ville de Paris)

A final layer of significance varnished the Franciscan church, one that resulted from the extrinsic circumstances of patronage. Fervently supported by Louis IX, the Madeleine almost immediately and universally was linked to the king by critics and champions alike. On the one side, Rutebeuf skewered royal policies that had allowed the Latin kingdom in the East to slip away while wasting money on grandiose buildings for the mendicants, while, on the other, Louis's subsidies for the construction of the Paris convent were lauded by the *Grandes Chroniques* as well as the king's biographers.[52] The Franciscans themselves, who had preached in the Sainte-Chapelle during the king's

[50] Parish church architecture in Paris during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries remains understudied. For the moment, the six volumes of Berty & Tisserand, *Topographie historique*; Christ, *Églises parisiennes*; and Lorentz& Sandron, *Atlas de Paris au Moyen Âge*, p. 126-129, will have to suffice.

[51] Bos, *Les Églises flamboyantes*, for a rich and detailed survey of Parisian church architecture of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Among the late Gothic churches that adopted the two-story elevation were Saint-André-des-Arts, Saint-Benoît, Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois, Saint-Gervais-et-Saint-Protais, Saint-Jacques-de la-Boucherie, Saint-Merry, Saint-Nicolas-des-Champs, Saint-Paul, and Saint-Sauveur. I am not suggesting that the Franciscan church was the direct source for these later structures, simply that it offered a nearby example of this *parti*.

lifetime and were instrumental in promoting his canonization, clearly fostered the close identification of their church with Louis as they installed his effigy on the west entrance that in effect cast him as founder.[53] Louis's daughter Blanche, his granddaughter, Marguerite de Clermont, granddaughter-in law, Jeanne de Navarre, and the heart of his great grandson, Phillip V were among the immediate family members buried in Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, underscoring the church's appeal to the Capetian aristocracy. Given the facts of the king's generosity, the recognition of his role in the construction of the church, complemented by the royal arms sparkling in the windows, the monarch's statue standing at the threshold of the portal, and his name echoing through the interior, should not Sainte-Marie-Madeleine be numbered among the "noble and magnificent edifices of the kingdom of France" found worthy of emulation throughout Europe?[54]

Exploring the reverberations of the Franciscan church of Paris on building projects both within and outside of the Order remains a study for another day. But might Sainte-Marie-Madeleine have figured into the conceptual mix of the plan designs and choice of columnar piers at the cathedrals of Narbonne and Toulouse?[55] To bishop Bertrand de l'Isle Jourdain of Toulouse or the archbishops of Narbonne, whose sees were embroiled in heresy and frequent revolt, the allure of a key church of the order charged with insuring theological orthodoxy and one intimately associated with the monarch must have been powerful.[56] The Madeleine offered an architectural pattern that both served expanded pastoral roles and whose associations proclaimed an ideology of apostolic piety.

Sainte-Marie-Madeleine in Paris warns us against equating importance with ornamental richness. This church should not be devalued because of what it does not have – compound piers, a transept, a triforium, and a stone-vaulted ceiling. True, the exclusion of these features may tell us the terms in which architectural magnificence was defined, at least in France, and the specific features identified by the Order as embodiments of immoderation and pride, but their absence can also be analyzed in a

[52] For Rutebeuf's criticism of the intimate relation between Louis IX and the Franciscans, Faral, "Le Procès", p. 255-258; Jean Dufournet, *Rutebeuf et les frères mendiants: Poèmes satiriques*, Paris, 1991, p. 165-166. In "Le Dit des Cordeliers", lines 65-68, the poet writes: "Les Cordeliers possédaient un dortoir, et un réfectoire, une belle église,/des vergers, des prés, des treilles - une demeure aussi belle qu'on peut le souhaiter./Or maintenant les personnes qui ne sont pas informées n'affirment-elles pas que c'est par convoitise/qu'ils ont abandonné cette première demeure pour en prendre une autre?" And in "La Complainte de Constantinople,", lines 109-120 Rutebeuf laments, "Que sont devenus les deniers/ que les Jacobins et Mineurs/ ont reçus par testaments… /Mais ils en usent autrement,/pour leurs grandes fondations,/et outre-mer Dieu reste nu."; see *Rutebeuf: Œuvres complètes*, trans. Michel Zink, Paris, 1989, p. 411. As seen above, Urban IV "enthusiastically praised" the king for his part in the construction of the church.

[53] For the Franciscans' close ties to and memorialization of Louis IX, see Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis*, p. 154-180. Beaumont-Maillet, *Le Grand Couvent*, p. 262, argues that the statue of Louis in the portal of the west entrance postdates his canonization in 1297. However, Dorothy Gillerman, "The Portal of St-Thibault-en-Auxois: A Problem of Thirteenth-Century Burgundian Patronage and Founder Imagery", in *The Art Bulletin*, 68, 1986, p. 567-580, explores the inclusion of contemporary figures on portals from around 1270. It should be remembered that "portraits," possibly of Louis and Marguerite de Provence appeared about the same time in the Porte Rouge at Notre-Dame in Paris, as discussed by M. Cecelia Gaposchkin, "The King of France and the Queen of Heaven: The Iconography of the Porte Rouge of Notre-Dame of Paris", in *Gesta*, 39, 2000, p. 58-92. For the issues of portraiture at the end of the thirteenth century, read the thoughtful study of Roland Recht, "Le Portrait et le principe de réalité dans la sculpture: Philippe le Bel et l'image royale", in *Europaïsche Kunst um 1300*, ed. Elisabeth Liskar , Vienna, 1986, p. 189-202.

[54] Christian Freigang, *Imitare ecclesias nobiles: Die Kathedralen von Narbonne, Toulouse und Rodez und die nordfranzösische Rayonnantgotik im Languedoc*, Worms, 1992, p. 11-16, has discussed this phrase that was actually part of a 1349 debate concerning the expansion of Narbonne Cathedral. Nevertheless, it does capture the sense of the wave of northern French influence in Languedoc at the end of the thirteenth century.

[55] Freigang, *Imitare ecclesias nobiles*, p. 268-280; 303-306 for the pier designs at Narbonne and Toulouse. Schenkluhn, *Ordines Studentes*, p. 82-83, drew passing attention to the similarity of the continuous series of chapels at Narbonne with the solution seen at Sainte-Marie-Madeleine.

[56] Archbishops of Narbonne Guy Foucois and Gilles Aycelin were both educated at in Paris and served in the royal administration, while Bishop Bertrand de l'Isle-Jourdain had been to Paris on diplomatic missions.

positive light. Its rejection of established signs, including bulwark-like towers, portals reminiscent of triumphal arches, a cruciform plan, and elaborate figural programmes in sculpture, glass, or paint, represents a positive and rational decision, one that led to the reworking of an established architectural syntax.

Finally, the church of the Franciscans invites us to follow Paul Crossley's lead in moving beyond monadic terms to think about the meanings and messages of medieval (or indeed any) buildings in more complex ways. Rather than searching for *an* iconography of Sainte-Marie-Madeleine, we may more effectively understand it in multiple layers laminated from the intentions and experiences of those who conceived, built, used, and interpreted, in stone or word, its structure and spaces. While far from the cell of "withies and branches of trees" fashioned for Francis at Portiuncula, the Madeleine offered a virtual illustration of the Order's prescriptive architectural statutes that, combined with its associations with a saint of revolutionary piety, a king of unrivalled stature, and the intellectual brilliance of the university in Europe's largest city, invested it with a special aura that spoke to all estates of the Christian public as it inspired succeeding generations of patrons and builders.[57]

[57] This incident is reported in chapter IX of "The Mirror of Perfection", trans. Robert Steele in *The Little Flowers of St. Francis, The Mirror of Perfection, The Life of St. Francis*, London & New York, 1934, p. 191-192.

The Imagery of the High Altar Piscina of Saint-Urbain at Troyes

Paul Binski

The piscina, the drain for washing the eucharistic vessels at Mass, in the south wall of the apse of the collegiate church of Saint-Urbain at Troyes undertaken by Pope Urban IV (1261-1264) in 1262-1263 (Figs 1, 2), forms but a small part of one of the most important Gothic churches of the thirteenth century. Didron, Salet and others all noted it, and Julian Gardner has placed it judiciously in the wider context of papal and curial patronage.[1] Gardner also anticipated the theme of this essay in observing that "The idea of the church as fortress and the symbolic use of military detailing in ecclesiastical architecture is a fertile field which awaits investigation".[2] The piscina was omitted in Sauerländer and Kroos's influential survey of French Gothic sculpture, even though it might have been placed profitably next to the remarkable facade sculptures of Auxerre cathedral in order to emphasize its modish elegance and "modernity".[3] It can no more be neglected than the architecture of the church of Saint-Urbain itself as a paradigm of things to come.

The double piscina consists of two bays with gabletted trefoil arches, with damaged figural sculpture set between the gables, the composition being topped by four polygonal canopies like those found over portal figures of the period, taking the form of crenellated turrets bristling with lively armed men peering out between the merlons with crossbows and other weapons (Fig. 3). It has two drains (for the priest's hands and for the cloths and vessels) and a credence shelf; it also retains traces of colour. The central composition shows the Coronation of the Virgin (Fig. 4) between candelabra with, on each side, two clerical donor figures, one holding a model of the church's apse, the other a model of its choir or transept. All the figures are now decapitated. Since the figure to the left wears the *rationale*, it seems beyond question that he is Urban IV, i.e. Jacques Pantaléon, the low-born son of a Troyes shoemaker and the first French pope for generations, and that the other figure is his wealthy nephew Cardinal Ancher Pantaléon of Troyes (d. 1286) who continued his uncle's work on the body of the church.[4]

[1] Joan Evans, *Pattern: A Study of Ornament in Western Europe from 1180 to 1900*, vol. 1, repr. New York, 1976, p. 19 and fig. 31; Adolphe N. Didron, "Une piscine du Moyen-Age", in *Annales archéologiques* 7, 1847, p. 36-40; Francis Salet, "Saint-Urbain de Troyes", in *Congrès archéologique*, 113, 1955, p. 96-122, here p. 105; Dieter Kimpel & Robert Suckale, *L'Architecture gothique en France 1130-1270*, Paris, 1990, p. 444; Jane Hayward, "The Church of Saint-Urbain at Troyes and its Glazing Program", *Gesta*, 37, 1998, p. 165-177; Julian Gardner, "Cardinal Ancher and the Piscina in Saint-Urban at Troyes", in *Architectural Studies in Memory of Richard Krautheimer*, ed. Cecil L. Striker, Mainz, 1996, p. 79-82.

[2] Julian Gardner, "The French Connection: Thoughts about French Patrons and Italian Art, c. 1250-1300", in *Art and Politics in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Italy: 1250-1500*, ed. Charles M. Rosenberg, Notre Dame & London, 1990, p. 81-102, at p. 90.

[3] Willibald Sauerländer, *Gothic Sculpture in France 1140-1270*, trans. Janet Sondheimer, London, 1972, pls. 283-287 for Auxerre; the piscina was presumably omitted in the belief that it post-dated 1270.

[4] Wilhelm Sievert, "Das Vorleben des Papstes Urban IV.", in *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Alterthumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*, 10, 1896, p. 451-505; Gardner, "Cardinal Ancher", p. 79-80; Julian Gardner *The Tomb and the Tiara: Curial Tomb Sculpture in Rome and Avignon in the Later Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1992, p. 74-76; also *ibidem*, "'Sepulchrum… Permagnificum et Sumptuosum inter Omnia Sepulchra Vicina': A Note on Cardinal Guillaume de Bray and His Tomb in Orvieto by Arnolfo di Cambio", in *Opere e giorni: Studi su mille anni di arte europea*, ed. Klaus Bergdolt & Giorgio Bonsanti, Venice, 2001, p. 85-90, here p. 87.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100146

Fig. 1 Troyes, Saint-Urbain, looking south-east, apse with piscina (Paul Binski)

Fig. 2 Troyes, Saint-Urbain, piscina (Paul Binski)

Fig. 3 Troyes, Saint-Urbain, detail of crenellations (Julian Gardner)

Fig. 4 Troyes, Saint-Urbain, piscina, Coronation of the Virgin (Julian Gardner)

Saint-Urban was begun at the east end in 1262-1263; plans to furnish its sanctuary are documented as early as 1264-1266. But in 1266 the east end was seriously affected by vandalism and fire arising from unrest provoked by the nuns of Notre-Dame-aux-Nonnains.[5] A high altar had been installed before 1266, since its damage in the unrest is recorded; possibly the apse itself had been glazed as well. A second campaign on the east end and transepts began in the 1270s under Ancher. There is therefore some question as to whether the present piscina was part of the furnishing orchestrated before 1264 by Urban IV which survived the fire, or was planned and installed in its entirety by Ancher after the fire. The present piscina shows no obvious signs of fire damage, and its structure does not course into the masonry of the apse. The fact that Ancher is shown on a par with Urban as its co-patron, holding a model of the transept of the church which corresponds to its likely state in the 1270s, should weigh in favour of a date under Ancher's tutelage for its execution. But it is not impossible that Ancher was replacing or completing something that Urban himself had planned, and that he was in effect commemorating his uncle. Of the two men, Urban was the thinker; and the piscina, I suggest, is thoughtful.

[5] For what follows on the issue of chronology, see SALET, "Saint-Urbain", p. 97, 105; Michael T. DAVIS, "On the Threshold of the Flamboyant: the Second Campaign of Construction of Saint-Urbain, Troyes", in *Speculum*, 59, 1984, p. 847-884, esp. p. 850-852, 853 n. 21; Caroline BRUZELIUS, "The Second Campaign at Saint-Urbain at Troyes", in *Speculum*, 62, 1987, p. 635-640; HAYWARD, "Church of Saint-Urbain", here p. 167; Michael T. DAVIS & Linda E. NEAGLEY, "Mechanics and Meaning: Plan Design at Saint-Urbain, Troyes and Saint-Ouen, Rouen", in *Gesta*, 39, 2000, p. 161-182, from p. 164; Christopher WILSON, "Not Without Honour Save in its Own Country? Saint-Urbain at Troyes and its Contrasting French and English Posterities", in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture*, ed. Alexandra GAJEWSKI & Zoë OPAČIĆ (Architectura Medii Aevi, 1), Turnhout, 2008, p. 107-121.

Saint-Urbain's high altar piscina was manifestly a set piece, since those in the side chapels are plainer, with tracery decoration. The main piscina exemplifies the way the church's first architect achieved brilliant transpositions of motifs: exterior gables appear in its window tracery, and crenellations on the piscina. Such things may be especially appreciated from an English perspective, for, as Jean Bony among others noted, Saint-Urbain's mannerisms were part of the genealogy of the Decorated Style, formed within what he called the "freer context of the English artistic tradition".[6] Many double piscinas of this type are English.[7] The 1260s were witnessing a new taste in the Anglo-French domain for smaller figure sculpture co-ordinated with gabular architectural forms, as on Auxerre Cathedral's west portal facade around 1260-1270, or Bishop Bridport's tomb (circa 1262) at Salisbury Cathedral. Troyes was part of this current, and may directly or indirectly have influenced the composition of such fourteenth-century English works as the arcade sculptures of the Lady Chapel at Ely and the spectacular Easter Sepulchre and sedilia arrangements at Hawton (Notts.) and Heckington (Lincs.); Heckington's sedilia gables are topped by a row of small crowned seated figures of Sts Margaret and Catherine with the Coronation of the Virgin to either side of the central gable, and not surprisingly the nearby piscina is lavishly arched.[8] A key augury at Troyes is the miniature crenellation. Again, there is an English dimension. Since features specific to Saint-Urbain demonstrably found their way to York Minster's north transept and the Chapter House project complete by circa 1288, we may look to its piscina as one possible source for the polygonal crenellated and inhabited features to either side of the Chapter House's entrance interior, which probably owed more to such specific microarchitectural stimulus than they did to earlier English ivory carvings, where similar motifs are found.[9] The short, square-topped crenellated pinnacles and "town canopies" which appear commonly in the microarchitecture of French sculpted portals (e.g. Chartres south portal), quite as much as the heraldry in the glass of a cathedral such as Chartres, remind us that military ideas were not a monopoly of the English. Crenellation is found commonly in French thirteenth-century manuscript illumination and in stained glass, as in the apse clearstory glass at Saint-Urbain itself.[10] In the roughly contemporary chapel of St. Gilles in the Burgundian priory church of St. Thibault-enAuxois is a piscina with a vaulted canopy topped with four tiny polygonal battlemented towers. The most sophisticated art of the period was already doing much to hammer home the association of the Church Militant with an appropriate array of castle-like forms.

But what intrigues particularly at Troyes is the piquant blend of military and peacable, sponsorial, Marian imagery. The association of Marian imagery with crenellations and actual soldiers – for the little town canopies and pinnacles on French portals do not as a rule have inhabitants – is new. In pointing to the crenellation of great churches including Saint-Denis and Reims as sources, Gardner sees in the miniature battlements at Troyes a specific circumstantial allusion to the events which de-

[6] Jean Bony, *The English Decorated Style: Gothic Architecture Transformed 1250-1350*, Oxford, 1979, for Saint-Urbain, p. 10-11, 46; quotation at p. 22.

[7] Francis Bond, *The Chancel of English Churches,* Oxford, 1916, p. 143-162; David Parsons "*Sacrarium*: Ablution Drains in Early Medieval Churches", in *The Anglo-Saxon Church: Papers on History, Architecture, and Archaeology in Honour of Dr. H. M. Taylor*, ed. Lawrence A. S. Butler & Richard K. Morris, London, 1986, p. 105-120; Justin Kroesen & Regnerus Steensma, *The Interior of the Medieval Village Church/Het middeleeuwse dorpskerkinterieur*, Leuven & Paris, 2004, p. 139-147.

[8] Nicola Coldstream, *The Decorated Style: Architecture and Ornament 1240-1360*, London, 1994, ills. 109-110.

[9] Wilson, "Not without Honour", for the English response; see also Nicola Coldstream, "York Chapter House", in *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 39, 1976, p. 15-23; Bony, *English Decorated Style*, p. 46. For an ivory chessman with inhabited battlements of circa 1220-1240, see *Age of Chivalry. Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400*, ed. Jonathan Alexander & Paul Binski, (exhibition catalogue, London, Royal Academy), London, 1987, no. 145.

[10] Robert Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis*, Berkeley, 1977; Gardner, "Cardinal Ancher", p. 82.

[11] Gardner, "Cardinal Ancher", p. 81.

tained the construction of the church in the 1260s, namely the assaults orchestrated by the disaffected nuns of Notre-Dame-aux-Nonnains during Ancher's tutelage.[11] Christopher Wilson has recently revived this idea, and has also suggested that the piscina's inhabited battlements may have derived from a secular Byzantine ivory casket in the treasury of Troyes Cathedral.[12] We will set aside whether or not a piscina would have been an appropriate place to make a locally-motivated political statement, as opposed to a sacramental one: would vandalistic intrusions provoked by local nuns really have been dignified by permanent commemoration in such a position? At stake here, however, is a question of method: tracing a visual lineage, no matter how plausible, for inhabited battlements in sculpture or ivory, is of little value to us if it does not also take into account the substantive content of the object in question, which at Troyes manifestly concerns the Virgin Mary, of whom battlements are, in effect, an attribute. The work of Charles Coulson has alerted us to the wider socio-aesthetic implications of crenellation;[13] and we still have to offer some account of its connection with the function of a piscina, the place where the fingers of the priest and the eucharistic vessels are cleansed after Mass.

The Virgin Mary, not crenellation, is therefore the logical starting-point. Though she was not the dedicatee of Saint-Urbain, her Coronation also appears in the glazing of the apse clearstory.[14] Finding Mary at Saint-Urbain is not wholly surprising. Her presence may illustrate one common point in the careers of Pope Urban and Cardinal Ancher, namely that they had both been canons of Laon Cathedral, a celebrated centre for the cult of the Virgin Mary and the collection of her miracles. It had been there that Jacques Pantaléon had had his first successes in study, and mounted the first steps in a career which led him to the throne of St. Peter.[15] The Coronation image thus signifies the sponsorship of the two patrons' devotional and professional lives.

Mary is framed by military motifs surprisingly often in Gothic art: in sculpture at Reims and Chartres;[16] in Scandinavian wood sculpture, as in the Madonna from Dal (Norway);[17] a Coronation of the Virgin with flanking crenellated towers is found on a silver-gilt book-box lid at St. Paul im Lavanttal made circa 1270 for Abbot Arnold II of St. Blasien (1247-1276);[18] and she is 'crenellated' in English illuminations[19]. In the thirteenth-century English illuminated Apocalypse in Lambeth Palace Library (MS 209), Mary appears raising a military saint – probably Mercurius – from his tomb and then guiding him into battle against Julian the Apostate, steering his lance.[20] The reasons for this military connection, made newly explicit by the literalism of Gothic art, are provided by such texts as Psalm 90:2, God my refuge, *refugium meum*, and the Song of Songs. As depicted in the Parisian *Bibles moralisées*, the Song of Songs 3:3, 4:4, 6:3 and 6:9 contains striking military imagery. In Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France MS lat. 11560 (fols 67, 78 and 85v), the text *invenerunt me vigiles qui custodiunt civitatem* (Song of Songs 3:3) is accompanied by a medallion showing the nightwatchmen as mailed girded soldiers; *sicut turris David collum tuum quae aedificata est cum propugnaculis mille clypei pendent* (Song of Songs 4:4) shows the Tower of David as a crenellated inhabited citadel slung with shields; and *pulchra es amica mea suavis et decora sicut Hierusalem terribilis ut castrorum acies*

[12] Wilson, "Not without Honour", p. 120 at note 26.

[13] Charles Coulson, "Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation: An Essay in the Sociology and Metaphysics of Medieval Fortification", in *Medieval Archaeology*, 26, 1982, p. 69-100, noted in Gardner, "French Connection", p. 90 and n. 60.

[14] Hayward, "Saint-Urbain", p. 169.

[15] Alexander Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1978, p. 226-227; Sievert, "Vorleben des Papstes Urban IV.", p. 451-464.

[16] Sauerländer, *Gothic Sculpture*, pls. 56-57, 79.

[17] Martin Blindheim, *Gothic Painted Wooden Sculpture in Norway 1220-1350*, Oslo, 2004, p. 106, no. 30.

[18] *Schatz aus den Trümmern: Der Silberschrein von Nivelles und die europäische Hochgotik*, ed. Hiltrud Westermann-Angerhausen & al. (exhibition catalogue, Cologne, Schnütgen-Museum), Cologne, 1995, p. 344 no. 34.

[19] Nigel J. Morgan, *Early Gothic Illuminated Manuscripts, 2* (A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles, 4), London, 1988, figs. 23, 86 etc.

[20] Nigel J. Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse: Manuscript 209 in Lambeth Palace Library*, London, 1990, p. 57-58, 62-65.

Fig. 5 Bible moralisée, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 11560, fol. 85v (after Alexandre de Laborde, *La Bible Moralisée illustrée, conservée à Oxford, Paris et Londres*, vol. 2, Paris, 1911-1927, pl. 309)

ordinata (Song of Songs 6:3) depicts Jerusalem with armed men (Fig. 5): "thou art beautiful, O my love, sweet and comely as Jerusalem: terrible as an army set in array".[21] The linkage of sponsorial and military imagery is undeniable, and we may suggest that the Song of Songs 6:3 comparing the Bride to Jerusalem was one point of reference for the piscina. Isaiah's magnificent prophecy of the coming of Christ, Isaiah 62:5-6 *et gaudebit sponsus super sponsam… super muros tuos Hierusalem constitui custodes*, a text illustrated in the *Bible moralisée* MS lat. 11560, fol. 128 is also directly relevant: "And the bridegroom shall rejoice over the bride: and thy God shall rejoice over thee. Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen, all the day and all the night: they shall never hold their peace". The Heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation is not infrequently shown with crenellated gates, as in the mid

[21] Alexandre De Laborde, *La Bible Moralisée illustrée, conservée à Oxford, Paris et Londres*, vol. 2, Paris, 1911-1927, pls. 300, 302, 309.

thirteenth-century Apocalypse in Trinity College, Cambridge (MS R.16.2, fol. 25v). In some sense, then, this is the image of a city – dare one think of *urbanitas*? – quite as much as of a church or castle.

Saint-Urbain's piscina's imagery may therefore simply have been an intelligent extrapolation from texts such as Isaiah 62:5-6 – which seems particularly close – and the Song of Songs: texts which will have been perfectly well known to those with a training in theology, and a far more authoritative source than any art object. The church was on the site of Urban's birthplace: in such a position, sponsorial imagery will have had more than one signification for him and his family. Urban also manifestly thought about images: he invoked the Song of Songs in a pastoral letter which accompanied the blackened image of the Holy Face of Laon sent by him to the nuns of Montreuil-les-Dames in 1249.[22] Pastoral allegory in thirteenth-century preaching and writing seems an especially fertile area of enquiry. In a sermon on the birth of the Virgin Mary, Hélinand de Froidmont presents her as a tower and throne, partly after the Song of Songs 7:4, imagery which consorts well with the Troyes piscina.[23] Such use of building as a vehicle for spiritual allegory or edification had been prompted by such texts as I Corinthians 3:10[24]. In edification, two similitudes are notable: the likeness of the person to a castle or palace, as inhabited by the soul, or of the person to a temple, inhabited by God, after 1 Corinthians 3:16-17. An early instance is Benzo of Alba's eleventh-century panegyric *Ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem* with its allegorical palace of virtue erected by Faith, Hope and Charity and Chastity installed at the gates.[25] Later medieval English pastoral instances are legion and include *Ancrene Wisse, Sawle's Ward, The Abbey of the Holy Ghost, Piers Plowman,* and *Castle of Perseverance*.[26] In a few instances, such as *The Abbey of the Holy Ghost*, based on *La Sainte Abbaye* the text is actually associated with the depiction of architecture.[27]

Into the "person as castle or temple" model fell a particularly rich exegesis which explicitly identified the Virgin Mary with a fortification, the origins of which dated no later than circa 1100 (and probably considerably earlier). This connected the Song of Songs with Luke 10:38 *et ipse [Jesus] intravit in quoddam castellum*. The *castellum* in question is the town of Bethany, the home of Mary and

[22] Discussed by Flora Lewis, "The Veronica: Image, Legend and Viewer", in *England in the Thirteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. W. Mark Ormrod, Harlaxton, 1985, p. 100-106, here p. 104-105.

[23] *Patrologia cursus completus: seria latina*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, 221 vols., Paris, 1844-1866, vol. 212, col. 667: *O pulcherrimum aedificium, quod et thronus et turris est! Thronus eburneus, turris eburnea; sed thronus propter Deum, turris propter homines.*

[24] Henri De Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'écriture*, 2/II (*Théologie*, 59), Paris 1962, p. 41-60; for specialist studies see Roberta D. Cornelius, *The Figurative Castle: A Study in the Medieval Allegory of the Edifice with Especial Reference to Religious Writings*, Bryn Mawr, 1930; Mary J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge, 1990, p. 122-155 and *passim*; Barbara E. Kurtz, "The Small Castle of the Soul: Mysticism and Metaphor in the European Middle Ages", in *Studia Mystica*, 15, 1992, p. 19-39; Jill Mann, "Allegorical Buildings in Mediaeval Literature", in *Medium Aevum*, 63, 1994, p. 191-210, here p. 198-200; Mary J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought. Meditation, Rhetoric and the Making of Images, 400-1200*, Cambridge, 1998; David J. Cowling, *Building the Text: Architecture as Metaphor in Late Medieval and Early Modern France*, Oxford, 1998; Lucy F. Sandler, "John of Metz, The Tower of Wisdom", in *The Medieval Craft of Memory: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures,* ed. Mary J. Carruthers & Jan Ziolkowski, Philadelphia, 2002, p. 215-225; Christiania Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind: A Study of Medieval Architectural Allegory*, Cardiff, 2003; Paul Binski, *Becket's Crown: Art and Imagination in Gothic England 1170-1300*, New Haven & London, 2004, p. 1-77, 181-186 etc.; Abigail Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle in Medieval England*, York, 2004.

[25] C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939-1210*, Philadelphia, 1985, p. 122-125.

[26] Leo Carruthers, "In Pursuit of Holiness Outside the Cloister: Religion of the Heart in *The Abbey of the Holy Ghost*", in *Models of Holiness in Medieval Sermons*, ed. Beverly M. Kienzle, Leuven, 1996, p. 211-227, at p. 222-225; cf. also Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind,* p. 87-116.

[27] As London, British Library MS Add. 39843, *L'Art au temps des rois maudits: Philippe le Bel et ses fils 1285-1328*, ed. Danielle Gaborit-Chopin et al., (exhibition catalogue, Paris, Musée de Louvre), Paris, 1998, no. 188.

Martha. Luke 10:38 was explored as the basis for the idea that Mary's body was in effect a castle in which Jesus sought refuge at the Incarnation. The idea is apparent in a homily of Ralph d'Escures, later Archbishop of Canterbury (1114-1122).[28] This homily influenced the commentary to the lessons for the Feast of the Assumption and on the Song of Songs assembled by Honorius Augustodunensis, the *Sigillum*, written circa 1100 at Worcester.[29] Later Cistercian commentaries seem to repeat the same concept.[30] Honorius is important because his *Gemma animae* appears to have influenced other texts on the signification of architecture and the parts of religious buildings, notably those by Hugues de Fouilly and Henry of Avranches.[31] His *Speculum ecclesie* uses the image of the body as a castle assailed by enemies.[32] In addition, as T.A. Heslop has recently emphasized, the circle of Honorius is also important for the development of the Coronation of the Virgin in exegesis of the liturgy of the Feast of the Assumption.[33] In effect, the origins of the Coronation lie in the same sphere as speculation on the idea of Mary's body as a castle: the two principal themes of the Troyes piscina have a linked intellectual genealogy.

Early development of an idea in a specific circle is one thing, its later diffusion another. From Honorius' *Sigillum* we proceed directly to the most elaborate and apparently influential thirteenth-century amplification of the theme of Mary as a castle, namely the vernacular texts grouped under the title *Château d'Amour* and attributed to Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (d. 1253). *Château d'Amour* may assist us as an example of Anglo-Norman pastoral writing originally aimed at seigneurial audiences and priests. Grosseteste is especially distinguished for his development and use of "romantic" military similitudes proper to the Christian-chivalric mindset: the Shield of Faith image appears to be his innovation, and his correspondence with the regent masters in theology at Oxford, and with his own chapter, shows that he found architectural metaphors for things spiritual invigorating.[34] Grosseteste's use of such imagery was not only a brilliant educational move, but also one pointer towards the legitimate militarization of the aesthetic of church architecture and internal furnishing apparent more widely from the 1240s onwards.[35] The recent work of Abigail Wheatley has independently lent some substance to this proposal.[36] Grosseteste's two most well known pastoral writings use both forms of similitude outlined earlier: the body as a castle (*Château d'Amour)* and as a temple (*Templum Domini*).[37] *Château d'Amour*, composed according to Kari Sajavaara in the 1230s or 1240s, enjoyed persistent dissemination in French and English.[38] As Gardner indicates, it influenced the early

[28] André Wilmart, "Les homélies attribuées à S. Anselme", in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 2, 1927, p. 16-23; Carruthers, "In Pursuit of Holiness", here p. 223; Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind,* p. 92-93.

[29] *Patrologia cursus completus: seria latina*, vol. 172, cols. 495-518; Valerie I. J. Flint, *Ideas in the Medieval West: Texts and Their Contexts*, London, 1988, p. 75-80, 219-221; see also p. 199-211; Richard W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*, Oxford, 1986, p. 226 note 32; and recently T. A. Heslop, "The English Origins of the Coronation of the Virgin", in *The Burlington Magazine*, 147, 2005, p. 790-797, at p. 792-793.

[30] Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle*, p. 78-81.

[31] Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind,* p. 50-56; Binski, *Becket's Crown*, p. 57-61.

[32] *Patrologia cursus completus: seria latina*, vol. 172, col. 1097.

[33] Heslop, "English Origins of the Coronation of the Virgin".

[34] Otto Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Lateinische Schriftquellen zur Kunst in England, Wales und Schottland vom Jahre 901 bis zum Jahre 1307*, Munich, 1955-1960, nos 5538-5539; Binski, *Becket's Crown*, p. 181-184.

[35] Binski, *Becket's Crown*, p. 184.

[36] Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle*, p. 78-111.

[37] *Robert Grosseteste, Templum Dei: Edited from MS. 27 of Emmanuel College, Cambridge*, ed. Joseph Goering & Frank A. C. Montello, Toronto, 1984; Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind,* p. 24-27.

[38] *Robert Grosseteste's Chasteau d'Amour*, ed. M. Cooke (Caxton Society, 15), London, 1852; Jessie Murray, *Le Château d'Amour de Robert Grosseteste, évêque de Lincoln,* Paris, 1918; *The Middle English Translations of Robert Grosseteste's Château d'Amour,* ed. Kari Sajavaara (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 32), Helsinki, 1967, p. 43-48; Christiania Whitehead, "A Fortress and a Shield: the Representation of the Virgin in the *Château d'amouur* of Robert Grossteteste", in *Writing Religious Women: Female Spiritual and Textual Practices in Late Medieval England*, ed. Denis Renevey & Christiana Whitehead, Cardiff, 2000, p. 109-132; Whitehead, *Castles of the Mind,* p. 93-99; Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle*, p. 94-97.

fourteenth-century allegorical frescoes in the lower church of the basilica of San Francesco at Assisi, presumably in part because the text reflects on the voluntary poverty of the Virgin, and perhaps more generally as a long-term result of Grosseteste's sympathy for the Franciscans; the bishop's direct pronouncements at the curia in 1250 were of a less pleasant order.[39]

Château d'Amour is an amplification of the established theme of Mary as the castle in which Christ seeks lodging. The fortress set on a rock is an impregnable bastion of virtue, a defence against the world, the flesh and the Devil. It possesses four towers surrounding a keep, three baileys and seven barbicans each with a gate. The keep is coloured green, blue and red, and is as white as snow within. From its well issue four streams which fill the moat, which symbolizes voluntary poverty. At its centre is a throne of ivory set on steps. The moralization which follows states that the castle is the Virgin Mary who defends us; the rock is her heart; the foundation is her faith, the green base, blue and red walls standing for the three Theological Virtues, Faith, Hope and Charity. The four towers are the four cardinal virtues, Justice, Fortitude, Prudence and Temperance. The highest bailey is the Virgin Mary's virginity, the middle her chastity and the lowest her marriage. The seven barbicans represent the Virtues which defeat the Seven Deadly Sins. The throne is Mary's; the well is the spring of Grace. It is this Castle which Christ enters through a closed door leaving it again still closed. The Castle is the Temple entered by the Lord, whose gate remains shut, in Ezekiel 44:1-2.

This allegorical castle is so carefully set out and coloured that it comes readily to the mind's eye, as must have been its intent; so much so, that it can firmly be said that the Troyes piscina belongs to its tradition of thought only in important essentials: common ideas include the castle as Mary the bastion, as an image of the Incarnation, as the refuge of Christ and Holy Church, and as the spring of the waters of Grace and penance. Mary has occupied her throne with her son, and "Jerusalem" has watchmen placed over it for their sake, after Isaiah 62:5-6. Nothing in *Château d'Amour* justifies the array of armed men on the battlements however. This allusiveness may have been generally typical of the later visual reception of the text, such as the unusual illustration preliminary to the Annunciation (fol. 60) on fol. 59 of the Taymouth Hours (British Library MS Yates Thompson 13), in which a seated Mary is crowned, framed by a crenellated edifice with four accompanying images which might signify the Four Cardinal Virtues.[40]

We recall that the image of the well of Grace was extended in the Assisi frescoes – which represent a similar sort of paraphrase of *Château d'Amour*– into an image of the sacrament of Baptism: this may specifically reflect *dictum* no. 43 of Grosseteste which describes the castle of the church protected by the walls of confession and penance and by the moat of baptism, since the Assisi picture includes the figure of Penance.[41] The concept is well suited to the rendering immaculate by water of the priest's fingers and eucharistic vessels.[42] In his *Gemma animae* Honorius Augustodunensis likens the Mass itself to an armed struggle.[43] Michael Evans sees the image of spiritual warfare as "a mystical

[39] Julian GARDNER, "Legates, Cardinals, and Kings: England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century", in *L'Europa e l'arte italiana*, ed. Max SEIDEL, (Collana del Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz, 3), Venice, 2000, p. 73-93, here p. 87-89; for Grosseteste's words to the curia, Servus GIEBEN, "Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia, Lyons 1250: Edition of the Documents", in *Collectanea Franciscana*, 41, 1971, p. 340-393.

[40] Noted by Loveday L. GEE, *Women, Art and Patronage from Henry III to Edward III, 1216-1377*, Woodbridge, 2002, p. 51, pl.12.

[41] WHITEHEAD, *Castles of the Mind,* p. 27.

[42] Joseph A. JUNGMANN, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, trans. Francis A. BRUNNER, vol. 2, Blackrock, 1986, p. 406, 416-417.

[43] *Patrologia cursus completus: seria latina*, vol. 172, col. 566.

analogue of sacramental power", notably in English monastic circles.[44] Durandus's *Rationale* is a late representative of this general tradition. Durandus's authority probably explains the more general use of the term piscina (*piscina seu lavacrum*) for such objects; and we note that he deploys military similitudes often in his account of the parts of a church.[45] In his two consecutive chapters on the sacristy and piscina, the sacristy signifies the womb of the Virgin Mary, the piscina the mercy of Christ, since washing signifies that in baptism and penance we are purified.[46]

Above all, we must bear in mind the contemporary stress on the purity of the eucharist and the other sacraments in the legislation of the Church, as in the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council. Urban IV himself instituted the feast of Corpus Christi, and was the author of pastoral writings.[47] The Troyes piscina may reflect the delicacy and thoroughness of his views on the Mass. There is no evidence that he or Ancher knew the writings of Grosseteste, though the Assisi evidence shows that they were familiar in some form in Franciscan or curial circles. The aim here has merely been to trace a general kinship of ideas rather than a formal illustrative principle. The witty movement of ideas manifest in the piscina found its natural outlet in the unconventional thinking of the church's architects.

Troyes' piscina is a practical exemplification of Coulson's concept, itself not very clearly worked out, of a "metaphysics of crenellation",[48] and it lends weight to the idea that crenellation in the Decorated Style was partly the outcome of spiritual thinking a few generations earlier: speculation anticipated the development of style. It does not follow that all church crenellations are explicable solely in terms of a relentless religious allegorizing, tightening meaning and excluding the possibility of other significations, or just the operation of taste. The point at stake is polemical: the piscina exposes the prejudices of those who have argued that the will-to-crenellate was the product of a romantic aesthetic of knights and ladies, of a promiscuous movement of pure forms regardless of spiritual signification. Arguably the tendency to romanticize and secularize what may be seen in origin as perfectly serious and respectable religious allegories may be one of the more pernicious outcomes of the Arthurian and formalist enquiries promoted in their different ways by such writers as R. S. Loomis and Jean Bony. Loomis was one of the first scholars to draw attention to the existence of a secular romantic tradition of the Castle of Love, the allegorical siege, which was actually performed as pageant by the early thirteenth century.[49] Doubtless in its later visual manifestations this secular play enjoyed some relationship with the religious tradition we have identified: its existence will have strengthened its power as a religious similitude. But as a concept the presence of Mary within a Castle manifestly belongs to an earlier more strictly biblical and liturgical interpretation. As Wheatley indicates, "…the Castle of Love, even in its most flamboyant and playful depictions, was capable of reflecting the imagery of the Marian castle of theological exegesis".[50] Jean Bony saw the use of flagpoles, shields, and crenellations in the English Decorated Style as essentially ludic. He appears not to have considered the issue of religious allegory at all. English religious architecture could toy with secular motifs because "ever since the arrival of Gothic little more than a century earlier, a general tone of playfulness – often with a touch of pure fantasy – had constantly been present in English architecture. Gothic was never taken quite seri-

[44] Michael Evans, "An Illustrated Fragment of Peraldus's Summa of Vice: Harleian MS 3244", in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 45, 1982, p. 14-46.

[45] *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale Divinorum Officiorum, I*, ed. Anselme Davril & Timothy Thibodeau (Corpus Christianorum, 140), Turnhout, 1995, book I, ch. 1 nos 11, 21, 25, 36 etc. for military similitudes.

[46] *Guillelmi Duranti Rationale Divinorum*, p. 23-24, book I ch. 1 nos. 38-39.

[47] Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*, Cambridge, 1991, p. 164, 175-177; Gardner, "Cardinal Ancher", p. 81.

[48] Coulson, "Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation".

[49] Roger S. Loomis, "The Allegorical Siege in the Art of the Middle Ages", in *American Journal of Archaeology*, 23, 1919, p. 255-269.

[50] Wheatley, *The Idea of the Castle*, p. 102-1055, at p. 104.

ously".[51] Such statements embody an impressive level of *a priori* nationalist stereotyping. Is the obviously French piscina at Troyes "playful"?

It strikes the present writer that to tackle this issue without any sympathy for allegory would be like trying to understand the very unplayful Lenin Mausoleum without any grasp of Communism. No work of art exists in a conceptual vacuum. At the level of purely formal insight, of course, Bony has a point: on the whole, English religious architecture was more prone than its French counterpart to employ military detailing. By the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the exterior and interior militarization of English parish churches, the major growth area of the times, was extraordinarily common. Why this should have been so remains to be explained, or even fully described. It certainly suggests than any attempt at a solely religious-symbolic explanation would be fruitless, given that such symbolism was not the special preserve of the English. Clearly the will-to-crenellate had social as well as religious aspects, including the political mentality which saw in crenellation something of legitimate interest to public power. Castellation expressed noble rank, and the aristocratic proclivities of the higher clergy set them well above the more humble members of the clerical class. As Coulson suggests, crenellation was "seigneurially demonstrative".[52] The question is whether style can owe its early impetus to imaginative thinking which is not solely aesthetic, and which might usefully be distinguished from later aesthetic routinization, in which motifs simply become ornamental resources. Might we not approach the Decorated and Perpendicular styles with regard not only to their social register of meaning and standing as architectural styles, but also to their metaphorical density and metaphysical wit? Play can be clever and deep, and it can serve serious purpose. Heir both to traditions of crenellation in French microarchitecture and, as suggested here, to speculation about Mary and the Incarnation, the Troyes piscina reminds us of the role of English theologians in the early formulation of the iconography of the Coronation of the Virgin and in the widespread use of military metaphors for the sacred. How just, then, that the influence of Troyes may have served to repatriate such ideas to England, the Decorated Style regarding the beauty and intelligence of French art as if seeing itself in a mirror.

[51] Bony, *The English Decorated Style*, p. 19.

[52] Coulson, "Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation", p. 92.

From a Restoration to a Peculiar Design: The Form of the Piers in the Nave of the Collegiate Church at Saint-Quentin (the First Third of the Fourteenth Century)

Peter Kurmann

The history of Gothic piers has still to be written. After labouriously debunking Viollet-le-Duc's rationalist interpretation of Gothic architecture, specialist scholars immersed themselves, perhaps for far too long, in the study of the technical and aesthetic function of the rib-vault. This is illustrated by Paul Frankl's great book on Gothic architecture, which thanks to the admirable effort of Paul Crossley has become again not only a most useful introduction to the study of Gothic architecture, but one of the highest landmarks in the historiography of this particular field.[1] While Frankl starts his history of Gothic architecture with a discussion of the role of the rib-vault[2] he speaks of the piers only in so far as they prepare the ribs on the lower level of the building.[3] The notion of the pier remains somewhat abstract in the whole of Frankl's study.

Was there a logical development of the pier in Gothic architecture? Early Gothic architects were of course much indebted to the compound piers of their Romanesque predecessors; this was also true for the huge columns – or better cylindrical piers – they sometimes employed as well. An alternating system permitted the use of both these forms together, and when architects opted for a row of cylindrical piers on either side of the nave – as at Laon cathedral or Notre-Dame in Paris – they certainly evoked the architecture of the Early Christian basilica.[4] In spite of its monumental grandeur, however, this system appeared inadequate to articulate the inherent logic of the whole building because it failed to ensure a visual link between the supports and the upper storeys of the edifice. Gothic cathedrals do of course not descend from heaven (as Hans Sedlmayr once argued),[5] so it is particularly awkward that at Laon and Paris the point of departure of the shafts rising to the vaults is situated on the abacus of the huge piers. Still, in the eastern bays of the nave of Laon cathedral an architect tried to wrap the cylindrical core into a shell of colonnettes which are arranged in an irregular rhythm so that this core is still visible. However, here the three colonnettes facing the nave do not exactly correspond to the vaulting shafts; equally, there exists no adequate visual element on the side within the arch.

Looking at this rather strange solution (which was conditioned by liturgical considerations),[6] the enthusiasm evinced by many scholars for the new type of pier invented by the master of Chartres – the "High Gothic pier" or *pilier cantonné* – is easy to understand.[7] This form combines a massive cylindrical core with four large shafts in such a way that two of them correspond to the arcades, one to the cluster of shafts going up to the main vault and the other supporting the diagonal and transverse ribs of the vaults in the side aisle.[8] There were of course precursors to this type of pier, for instance in

[1] Paul Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, rev. Paul Crossley, New Haven & London, 2000.

[2] *Ibidem*, p. 41-53.

[3] *Ibidem*, p. 53-64.

[4] Willibald Sauerländer, "Abwegige Gedanken über frühgotische Architektur und 'The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century'", in *Études d'art médiéval offertes à Louis Grodecki*, ed. Sumner McKnight Crosby, Paris, 1981, p. 167-184.

[5] Hans Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, Zurich, 1950, p. 59-66.

[6] Eric Fernie, "La fonction liturgique des piliers cantonnés dans la nef de la cathédrale de Laon", in *Bulletin monumental*, 145, 1987, p. 257-266.

[7] Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, p. 114-115, 143.

[8] For a good definition of this type of support see Jean Bony, *French Gothic Architecture of the 12th and 13th Centuries*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London, 1983, p. 239.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100147

Fig. 1 Saint-Sulpice-de-Favières, Parish (and pilgrimage) Church, nave, south side, first pier from the east (Katarina Papajanni)

the galleries of the Romanesque nave of Tournai Cathedral or in the early Gothic choir of Canterbury,[9] but in its high Gothic guise this type of support fitted perfectly well into the monumental design of Chartres which inspired the cathedrals of Reims and Amiens. At Chartres the support is treated as an independent structural and sculptural unit, while at the same time the four encircling secondary columns have been assigned specific functions within the larger architectural framework. However, this solution appears somewhat strained because of the clear break between the column corresponding to the cluster of the vaulting shafts. This explains why the architects of Reims and Amiens solved the problem of the linkage between the support and the wall in quite different ways.

With the abandonment of the sculptural effect of buildings in favour of a more coherent and absolute texture that also included the piers, the formula of the *pilier cantonné* went out of fashion.This is shown not only by the abbey church of Saint-Denis, the masterpiece of the early French "Rayonnant" so brilliantly analysed by Caroline Bruzelius,[10] but also by other buildings in the new style, such as the wonderful parish and pilgrimage church of Saint-Sulpice-de-Favières south of Paris (Fig. 1). Whereas the master of Saint-Denis chose a thinned-out version of the Romanesque cruciform pier,[11] the architect of Saint-Sulpice created a new type of support. What category of pier does this new design belong to? Are we dealing with a compound pier or a clustered one?

If we apply here the definition of a clustered pier – a support of which the core is no longer visible because it is concealed by closely-spaced, projecting colonnettes – we run into difficulties. There is certainly no visible core at Saint-Sulpice-de-Favières, but the rectangular parts between the colonnettes corresponding to the arcades and the responds of the vaults in the aisle could be interpreted as the remains of a cruciform pier, although the angles are hollowed out. I am aware of the fact that this interpretation, which is chiefly concerned with the ground plan and not with the overall visual effect of this elegant support, is a purely academic one.This example shows just how problematic an evolutionary teleology with its corresponding terminology really is. There seems to be a general consensus that after the "classical" interlude of the *pilier cantonné* the cruciform compound pier was replaced by the clustered pier.[12] Was the core of this type of support circular, oval or rectangular? Where are the

[9] Hans Reinhardt, "Die Entwicklung der gotischen Travee", in *Gedenkschrift Ernst Gall*, ed. Margarete Kühn & Louis Grodecki, Munich, 1965, p. 123-142, here p. 132; Bony, *French Gothic Architecture*, p. 500, note 29, denies the role of the Canterbury pier as a prototype for Chartres.

[10] Caroline Astrid Bruzelius, *The 13th-Century Church at Saint-Denis* (Yale Publications in the History of Art, 33), New Haven & London, 1985.

[11] *Ibidem*, p. 143-144.

[12] The forms of support in Gothic architecture remain an understudied subject. A comparison between Georg Dehio & Gustav von Bezold, *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes*, vol. 2, Stuttgart, 1901, p. 128-130, 184 and Wilhelm Schlink, *Die gotischen Kathedralen Frankreichs*, Munich, 1978, p. 103-107, 172 shows that our knowledge of this topic has hardly progressed during the course of the twentieth century (even though Schlink has the merit of having at least picked out the Gothic pier as a theme).

first examples of such piers to be found? If we suppose that the support of Saint-Sulpice-de-Favières (Fig. 1) is constructed on an elliptical base and if we accept Branner's dating of the building to "shortly after 1245",[13] we may conclude that the architect of this little masterpiece has invented one of the first clustered piers – and perhaps the very first one.

However, trying to find a large number of piers with a circular or an oval core in Gothic architecture after 1250 is probably a futile exercise. Most of these later piers rise over a square or rectangular plan that is positioned diagonally to the longitudinal axis of the building. In some cases, however, the form of the ground plan of the pier is ambiguous. The piers of Saint Vincent at Metz[14] may for instance have been extrapolated from either a circle or a square, or, alternatively, from a Greek cross.

As the following example will show, we can detect no linear development in the general form and the moulding system of piers between about 1250 and 1330-1340, neither in France nor elsewhere.[15] At the most we can say that some types that had been developed in the first half of the thirteenth century were varied again and again. Sometimes the dissemination of models took place over both long distances and long periods. In other cases new models were developed with remarkable independence.

One of the most curious cases of designing a new type of a support is to be found in the nave of the collegiate church at Saint-Quentin (Figs. 7, 8). While the choir was under construction from around 1200 to the end of the thirteenth century,[16] a series of rather unexpected circumstances occurred, which in turn prompted a later architect, who had been commissioned by the canons to draw up plans for the nave, to devise a very peculiar solution for the piers. As we know from the written sources, the nave of Saint-Quentin was built during the first half of the fifteenth century. This was the result of the last building campaign of this enormous, cathedral-like collegiate church. This "most unexpected building"[17] is remarkable for at least three reasons. Not only does it feature two transepts, but it also has an ambulatory whose individual bays curve toward the attached polygonal chapels (Fig. 7).This creates the impression that two rings of chapels surround the great apse of the choir. Another outstanding characteristic is the clerestorey, which is higher than the arcades of the nave. This design abandons the "classical" equilibrium of the proportions found around 1200 in the three-storey elevations of Soissons, Chartres and Reims, instead placing emphasis on the upper parts.[18] It is not certain whether the exaggerated height of the clerestorey was planned right from the outset, but there are good reasons to assume that this was the case.[19] The almost hypertrophic and to a great degree eclectic architecture of Saint-Quentin[20] (Fig. 8) can be explained by a special need for compensation.[21] The canons of this collegiate church never forgot that in the sixth century the seat of the bishop had been transferred from Saint-Quentin to Noyon. They thus may have felt obliged to outdo the neighbouring cathedrals of Laon, Reims and Cambrai with a building that was in many respects even more extraordinary than these churches.

[13] Robert BRANNER, *St Louis and the Court Style in Gothic Architecture*, London, 1965, p. 74. This early date is also proposed by Claudine LAUTIER, "Le chevet de Saint-Sulpice-de-Favières", in *Information de l'histoire de l'art*, 17, 1972, p. 40-45.

[14] Christoph BRACHMANN, *Gotische Architektur in Metz unter Bischof Jacques de Lorraine (1239-60): Der Neubau der Kathedrale und seine Folgen*, Berlin, 1998, p. 55-75, 304 (figs. 27-28) ; Marc Carel SCHURR, *Gotische Architektur im mittleren Europa 1220-1340: Von Metz bis Wien*, Munich & Berlin, 2007, p. 74-78, 338.

[15] This will be shown in a study on French Rayonnant church architecture between 1230 and 1340, currently in preparation; for a more general discussion of the same subject in the Holy Roman Empire see SCHURR, *Gotische Architektur im mittleren Europa*.

[16] For chronological considerations see below.

[17] Jean BONY, *French Gothic Architecture*, p. 281.

[18] See the calculated proportions in Pierre HÉLIOT, *La basilique de Saint-Quentin*, Paris, 1967, p. 30-31.

[19] BONY, *French Gothic Architecture*, p. 287-288.

[20] These eclectic tendencies at Saint-Quentin were already noted in Dieter KIMPEL & Robert SUCKALE, *Die gotische Architektur in Frankreich 1130-1270*, Munich, 1985, p. 350.

Let us sum up the history of the construction of Saint-Quentin, as far as the current state of research allows us to.[22] Construction began with the radiating chapels in the first decade of the thirteenth century. In 1257, when the translation of the relics of St Quentin and other saints was celebrated in the presence of Louis IX, the choir must have been completed in its eastern parts, comprising radiating chapels, ambulatory, main apse and narrow transept, while of the four straight bays of the liturgical choir only the arcades had been built. If this chronology is correct, the arcades of the east wall of the west transept may also have been erected before 1257. Thus the liturgical choir, covered by a provisional roof over the zone of the arcades and temporarily closed with wooden framework towards the west, would have been fully functional for the celebration of the liturgy. The construction of the upper parts of the straight bays of the choir as well as the south facade of the great transept followed in the second half of the thirteenth century.[23] The decorative repertoire of the triforium, the window traceries of the east wall of the south transept, and of the inner wall of the great south façade suggests a date of circa 1300;[24] this also applies to the western arcades of the south transept, and to the south-western crossing pier, which is an exact copy of its eastern, almost a century-old counterparts. Thereafter the construction of the great transept advanced only slowly. Its north façade (or at least the upper parts thereof) were built in the years after 1399 by an architect named Gilles Largent;[25] by this time at the latest the two side walls of the north wing of the great transept had also reached their full height. By circa 1400 then the great transept was finally completed. The construction of the nave followed immediately afterwards – thus, in 1404 the first pier of the north side (next to the crossing) had gone up.[26] The construction of the nave approached completion in the middle of the fifteenth century after having been more or less successfully connected to the great tower from the second half of the twelfth century. The two-tower facade planned at the beginning of the sixteenthth century was never realized.

Unfortunately at Saint-Quentin artistic ambition and technical quality were not always on par with each other. This remark pertains to the choir, not the nave. At the end of the Middle Ages, the piers and the vaults of the choir had to be repaired several times. The most important restoration – at least as far as this paper is concerned – entailed the strengthening of the straight bays of the choir in 1316 by a stonemason called Jean le Bel (Fig. 2).[27]

Before we turn to the particulars of this restoration, let us have a look at the nave which in contrast to the choir was always structurally sound (Fig. 8). When were the plans for the nave drawn? This question is legitimate for two reasons. On the one hand, as the west facade of Cologne cathedral demonstrates, architectural projects were sometimes realized long after they had first been projected.[28] On the other hand, in stylistic terms most of the forms of the nave at Saint-Quentin seem to be older

[21] *Ibidem*.

[22] The essential studies on this building are Pierre Héliot, "Chronologie de la basilique de Saint-Quentin", in *Bulletin monumental*, 118, 1959, p. 7-50; Héliot, *La basilique*, p. 13-18, 37-40, 67-78, 90-91; Ellen M. Shortell, *The Choir of Saint-Quentin: Gothic Structure, Power and Cult*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Columbia University, New York, 2000, which I consulted in the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich; Mathieu Tricoit, *Le chevet de la collégiale de Saint-Quentin (Aisne), état de la question et perspectives* (Mémoire de Master II en histoire de l'art et archéologie médiévale), Université Lille III, Charles-de-Gaulle, 2005. I thank Mathieu Tricoit for providing me with a copy of his *Mémoire*. I hesitate to agree with Shortell's early dating of all parts of the collegiate church. See also Ellen M. Shortell, "Dismembring Saint Quentin: Gothic Architecture and the Display of Relics", in *Gesta*, 36, 1997, p. 32-47.

[23] Tricoit, *Le chevet*, correctly dates the clerestorey of the straight bays of the choir to the 1260s.

[24] Dany Sandron indirectly but correctly dates the south façade of the great transept of Saint-Quentin to the last quarter of the thirteenth century, emphasizing that it is impossible to decide whether the north transept façade of Soissons Cathedral (begun in the 1270s) was modelled on the south transept façade of the collegiate church in Picardy or if the influence went the other way. See his *La cathédrale de Soissons: Architecture du pouvoir*, Paris, 1998, p. 136-139, 179.

[25] Héliot, *La basilique de Saint-Quentin*, p. 72, note 9, p. 73.

[26] *Ibidem*, p. 74.

[27] *Ibidem*, p. 41, 71-72.

[28] Marc Steinmann, *Die Westfassade des Kölner Domes: Der mittelalterliche Fassadenplan F* (Forschungen zum Kölner Dom, 1), Cologne, 2003, p. 220.

than they actually are. If one leaves out of this account a few ogee arches and a small number of flowing tracery configurations in some of the windows, the architecture of the nave speaks the language of Rayonnant rather than Flamboyant Gothic. This impression of what may be called stylistic retardation is strengthened in particular by the tracery of the triforium, with its consistent display of a trefoil crowning a three-cusped arch – a formula that had been invented as early as the 1260s.

The piers of the nave arcades with their four thick main shafts even evoke the old compound Romanesque form (Fig. 8). But appearances can be deceptive. And here we come back to the restoration of the choir piers in 1316. This work was undertaken because the mass of these cylindrical piers was no longer sufficient to support the upper structure; to tackle this problem, the mason added a supplementary support on the inner side aisle. This support is composed of a more or less rectangular part whose longer sides are enlivened by three roundels partially surrounded by hollows, and whose smaller side – turned toward the aisle – is articulated by a thick octagonal shaft corresponding to the transverse rib of the aisle vault (Fig. 2). In tandem with its rectangular respond this design may be considered as a kind of "quotation" of the analogous parts of the crossing piers that had certainly been projected before 1257 (Fig. 3). I presume that the intermediary piers (corresponding to the row of piers separating the two side aisles of the choir) of the east wall of the great transept were also reinforced at the beginning of the fourteenth century (Figs. 4, 5). In the north transept wing the design of this pier comprises a cylinder surrounded by thicker and thinner colonnettes alternating with each other (Fig. 4). This form is derived from the piers that separate the two side aisles of the choir in Amiens Cathedral (built in the 1230s).[29] In the early fourteenth century the pier was then expanded toward the east by means of a rectangular support ending in a tripartite

N

0 1m

Fig. 2 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, choir, central nave, south side, supplementary support of the first pier west of the lesser transept (Katarina Papajanni and Peter Kurmann)

N

Fig. 3 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, south-west crossing pier of the greater transept (Katarina Papajanni)

[29] Stephen Murray, *Notre-Dame, Cathedral of Amiens: The Power of Change in Gothic*, Cambridge, 1996, p. 65, figs. 74, 75.

Fig. 4 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, intermediary pier on the east side of the north wing of the greater transept (Katarina Papajanni)

Fig. 5 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, intermediary pier on the east side of the south wing of the greater transept (Katarina Papajanni)

Fig. 6 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, nave, south side, first pier west after the main crossing (Katarina Papajanni)

Fig. 4

Vers 1195 - vers 1220.
Vers 1229 - vers 1450.
1477 - vers 1493.
XVIIe siècle.

Fig. 6 Fig. 3 Fig. 5 Fig. 2

Fig. 7 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, ground plan, indicating piers on Figs 2-6 (after Pierre Héliot, *La basilique de Saint-Quentin*, Paris 1969)

cluster of colonnettes separated by rather flat hollows. The corresponding pier (erected in my opinion shortly before 1257) in the south wing of the great transept shows a more complicated design (Fig. 5). Before being reinforced it was composed of half a cylinder accompanied by two thick shafts corresponding to the arcades. This core was enriched by a big cluster of five colonnettes rising to the high vault of the transept. These colonnettes are separated by mouldings which form very sharp edges because they combine straight mouldings with hollow ones.[30] At the beginning of the fourteenth century this pier was enlarged eastwards by a rectangular support that copies exactly those parts added to the piers in the main vessel of the choir (Fig. 2). There is only one notable difference between the two: On the transept pier the additional thick shaft is round (Fig. 5) and not polygonal like Jean le Bel's colonnettes in the choir (Fig. 2).

It was this enlarged intermediary pier of the southern wing of the transept which the architect of the nave took as a model for his own piers (Fig. 6), even though he now regularized their shape by choosing a rectangular core. There is no doubt that the nave piers of Saint-Quentin owe their peculiar and very unique form to the restoration of the pier in the south-western transept wing (Fig. 5). From this fact we may infer that the planning of the actual nave took place during the first third of the fourteenth century – in other terms during a period in which the patterns used for the reinforcement of the piers in the choir and in the eastern part of the great transept were still of topical interest. If the piers of the nave had been designed around 1400 they would have been quite different. But why did

[30] There are certain similarities between this pier at Saint-Quentin and the intermediary piers of the eastern walls of the transept in Meaux Cathedral, constructed by Gautier de Varinfroy between the 1250s and 1270, although here the outline of the cluster is more fluid; see: Peter Kurmann, *La cathédrale Saint-Etienne de Meaux: Étude architecturale* (Bibliothèque de la Société Française d'Archéologie, 1), Geneva & Paris, 1971, p. 59-77, 85, 88-89, fig. 37.

Fig. 8 Saint-Quentin, Collegiate Church, general view, looking east (Peter Kurmann)

the lodge of Saint-Quentin opt for such an old form when, quite clearly, the more sophisticated mouldings of the *style flamboyant* were in fashion? That is another story. At least we can say that those who conducted the last building campaigns at Saint-Quentin were not the only ones at the end of the Middle Ages who felt obliged to keep up the ideal of architectural conformism. The positive outcome of this was that the younger and older parts became more alike (Fig. 8), thus endowing the edifice with an overwhelming visual unity.

The Drawings in the Lodge Book of Villard de Honnecourt

Wolfgang Schenkluhn

Modern frameworks

The varieties of medieval ecclesiastical architecture are invariably categorized under four main headings: the basilica, the hall church, the centralized building and the single-aisled church (*Saalkirche* or *nef unique*). While the centralized structure comprises all categories of church organized around a single centre, the other types include any form of space organized around a longitudinal axis. The single-aisled church thus features a longitudinal and un-divided space, while the hall church and the basilica subdivide that space by pillars or columns. The hall church is seen as a building of which the aisles are of similar or identical height, whereas the basilica is distinguished by its heightened central aisle and clerestory.

Guided by these few fixed points of definition, architectural history has been highly successful in grouping of its objects of interest. In many cases these categories have formed the foundation for a history of different building epochs, different schools, and specific buildings and their followers.

However, what appears to be a purely empirical framework is, for a start, the specific product of the way we perceive architecture, the way we move through a building's interior. It is striking that our categorization of medieval church architecture proceeds from the distinguishing characteristics of the nave – namely, the direction, the number and the height of its aisles. It is no coincidence that these peculiarities are the first to be registered by the viewer on entering the church. And, equally consistent with this subjective taxonomy, the particular handling of the walls, the pillars and the vaults, which are perceived by the visitor only upon closer inspection, are relegated to subcategories of classification, such as basilicas with galleries, pillars, and columns, or the flat-roofed or vaulted basilicas. Because our taxonomy of churches has largely been determined by the nave, architectural history has produced no correspondingly firm typology for the choir. Instead, the fundamental characteristics derived from the nave are carried over into the choir and all the other parts of the medieval church. We thus talk about a basilican transept, hall crypts, and basilican or hall ambulatories. But this kind of typology also frequently leads to an intermingling of the types and their features, such as the "basilican centralized building" or the "basilican ground plan", the latter being a transposition onto a ground plan of a characteristic proper to elevations.

It is easy to see that the four basic types of medieval architecture are the product of modern classificatory concepts. The question then arises as to when, where and in what context these classifying principles (defining the church from the vantage point of the nave) actually originated? Were taxonomical principles already prevalent during the Middle Ages? And if this were indeed the case, were these principles comparable to our present perceptions? An important document containing some answers to these questions is the collection of "building drawings" in the Lodge Book of Villard de Honnecourt, to which we will now turn.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100148

The Lodge Book of Villard de Honnecourt

Art historical research is by no means unanimous in its views on the purpose and intentions of the so-called "Lodge book" of Villard de Honnecourt from Picardy. Was it a compendium designed to help building practice, or something of a textbook, or a kind of "private" sketchbook? Was its well travelled author a practising architect or only an architecture-loving dilettante? We know nothing for certain, despite the plain sounding greeting with which Villard addresses the reader of the book at its very beginning, and which characterizes the work as a teaching manual: "Villard de Honnecourt greets you and bids all those who work with the devices found in this book to pray for his soul and to remember him. For in this book one will find good advice concerning the proper technique of masonry and the devices of carpentry. You will also find the technique of drawing – the forms – just as the art of geometry requires and teaches it".[1]

The difficulties in assessing the Villard book lie, above all, in the uniqueness of the collection, for which there is nothing comparable in the Middle Ages. Moreover, scarcely half of all its pages have survived, pages whose *recto* and *verso* sides are decorated with numbers of drawings with explanatory captions. Of these, a minority are devoted to architecture. Scattered throughout the book we find the ground plan and elevation of a tower, the drawings of a traceried window and two rose windows, as well as drawings of diverse cross sections of pillars and wall responds side by side with two elevation drawings of Reims Cathedral. The viewer will not find the kinds of views of architecture known from contemporary manuscript illumination, nor are there drawings for façades (the first façade drawings date to the second half of the thirteenth century). Surviving in larger numbers, however, are differently executed ground plans of churches that have never been closely analysed. Attention has so far focused on their representational accuracy and on the manner and technique of the representation itself. It is precisely these drawings that yield the answers to the questions posed by us earlier about the origins of typological classification.

The ground plan as a "schema"

The first ground plan that we find in Villard's collection is an abstract construction, an outline drawing on the *verso* of a leaf, placed in the left lower corner, and showing an easily comprehensible schema for the choir and transept of a church (Fig. 1). Walls, pillars and vault springers are represented in thin lines. Villard himself explains the drawing as the depiction of a "glize desquarie", a "church in the manner of a square, intended as a building of the Cistercian order".[2]

This figure is no cursory sketch, hastily drawn onto the page. It is, rather, a schema for a Cistercian church. Already during the lifetime of St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), the Cistercians had habitually constructed churches "in the manner of a square", with a straight-ended choir and similarly flat-ended transept chapels. One thinks of the oldest surviving example of this type, the monastic church at Fontenay. A polygonal choir with an ambulatory was built at St Bernard's church at Clairvaux only after his death. However, already the rebuilding of the mother church at Cîteaux saw the recur-

[1] Hans R. Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt: Kritische Gesamtausgabe des Bauhüttenbuches ms. fr 19093 der Pariser Nationalbibliothek*, Graz, 1972, p. 11-12, pl. 2. François Bucher's English edition "The Lodge Book of Villard de Honnecourt", in François Bucher, *Architector: The Lodge Books and Sketchbooks of Medieval Architects*, vol. 1, New York, 1979, p. 15-193, is now largely superseded by Carl F. Barnes, *The Portfolio of Villard de Honnecourt (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Fr 19093)*, Abingdon, 2009.

[2] Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt*, p. 65, pl. 28; the original caption reads: "Vesci une eglize desquarie ki fu esgardee a faire en l`ordene d(e) Cistiaus ".

Fig. 1 Villard de Honnecourt, chevet plans of Cambrai Cathedral and a church scheme, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr 19093 (after Hans R. Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt*, Graz, 1972, pl. 28)

rence of the "square-planned" choir form (Fig. 2). Here the box-choir and the ambulatory were combined into a new form, which made history. And it was, above all, through the daughter houses of Morimond that this new type of rectilinear choir with an ambulatory was disseminated throughout central and eastern Europe.[3] Villard's drawing of this important invention shows that contemporaries were very much aware of what the basic layout of a Cistercian church should look like.

Schemata such as Villard's have a long tradition in the representation of churches, and are first found in the writings of the early Middle Ages. They appear in the pilgrim book of the Gallic bishop Arculf, the *Liber de locis sanctis* (circa 670), which contains descriptions of twenty-three churches of the Holy Land.[4] Attached to the text are four ground plan schemata, among them the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem (Fig. 3), and the church over the Fountain of St James. The outline of St James's church is described as *quasi in similtudinem crucis*, and the Holy Sepulchre is called the *ecclesia*

[3] Matthias Untermann, *Forma Ordinis: Die mittelalterliche Baukunst der Zisterzienser*, Munich, 2001, see also Hanno Hahn, *Die frühe Kirchenbaukunst der Zisterzienser*, Berlin, 1958.

[4] Julius von Schlosser, *Quellenbuch zur Kunstgeschichte des abendländischen Mittelalters,* Vienna, 1896, p. 50-59.

rotundae formulae super sepulcrum aedificata (Fig. 4).

The descriptive classification of a church in terms of its fundamental geometrical form, disregarding its actual shape, undoubtedly served to enhance its symbolic-theological meaning. One should not forget that texts on the symbolism of churches such as that by the Venerable Bede (674-735) belong to the same epoch as the *Liber de locis sanctis*. Right from the outset schemata were identified with specific meanings. This is suggested by written sources on new church buildings or monastic architecture, in which the constant emphasis is on the need for this or that church to be built according to a better, more beautiful, or more renowned schema.[5] Julius von Schlosser noted this tendency in his essay on artistic tradition in the late Middle Ages, "where new [building] projects were underway, there we frequently find, especially in the earlier periods, that particular process of alignment with certain related schemata, an alignment either with their form or their content".[6] It is clear that the medieval use of schemata also involved the concept of appropriateness, which grew out of a rhetorical context. A short etymological explanation is in order here.

Fig. 2 Cîteaux, Cistercian Church, ground plan (after Hanno Hahn, *Die frühe Kirchenbaukunst der Zisterzienser*, Berlin, 1958)

In Greek the word *σΦñμα* ("schema") refers to the artificial posture of athletes, actors, and also of sculpture, in contrast to people's everyday demeanour. Schemata were figures formed according to the rules of art. Thus for the Romans the term *figurae* meant all artificial forms of expression in so far as they deviated from everyday usage.[7] It was Quintillian, the master of antique rhetoric, who probably came up with the most memorable explanation – namely, that a *figura* is "a well-considered variation, whether of thought or speech, in contrast to its customary and simple manifestation".[8] Only the appropriate word could transform everyday usage into ornate language.

[5] Otto Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Schriftquellen zur Kunstgeschichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts für Deutschland, Lothringen und Italien*, Berlin, 1938, nos. 707, 682, 1524.

[6] Julius Von Schlosser, "Zur Kenntnis der künstlerischen Überlieferung im späten Mittelalter", in *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 23, 1903, p. 284.

[7] Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, Munich, 1973, § 499.

[8] Quintilianus, *Institutionis Oratoriae libri XII*, ed. and transl. Helmut Rahn, vol. 2, Darmstadt, 1975, p. 257.

Fig. 3 Jerusalem, Church of the Holy Sepulchre, from Arculf, *Liber de locis sanctis*, Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek (after Paolo Piva, *Architettura medievale*, 2008, p. 70)

Fig. 4 Jerusalem, plan of S James's marking the position of the well, from Arculf, *Liber de locis sanctis* (Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek)

If we apply this notion of the importance of the schematic figure to Villard's line drawing, we find that it is a conscious variation of the normal forms of architecture. The "church according to the square" is, in light of rhetorical usage, a special figure, appropriate to the Cistercian order. For us today "schemata" mean only pre-cast stereotypes, passively imitating their models. This notion is diametrically opposed to the medieval concept of the schema.

The appropriateness of Villard's figure for the Cistercian order resides not just in the special meaning it had for the order; for Villard, it also was in some way "typical". Villard's schematic drawing gives us a foothold in the medieval concept of types and typology. Surprisingly, in this case, the medieval type is a ground plan, whereas for us today it is the elevation.

Let us make a counter-investigation. Just next to the small outline drawing is the representation of an actual building – the ground plan of the choir of the now-destroyed cathedral of Cambrai. Its caption runs: "Here is the ground plan ('esligment') of the choir of Our Lady's Church at Cambrai, as it should rise from the foundations".[9] The drawing conveys that sense of rising from the foundations, for Villard reproduces in the most meticulous way the outline of the wall, from the radiating chapels up to the transept chapels. By contrast, hardly any attention is paid to the structural relationships within the space of the church. The circular responds and pillars as well as the incomplete octagonal crossing pillars appear simplified. Sometimes the pillars are not placed exactly onto the axes of each bay but instead are cursorily placed on a grid of auxiliary lines. Likewise, the configurations of the vaults are not marked distinctly. The "esligment" of Cambrai therefore amounts to little more than the presentation of an outline. As in the church "according to the square", the inner structure plays a subordinate role. And yet the two drawings are different in fundamental ways. Cambrai is the copy of an actual, existing church; it is no schema.

The ground plan as an idea of the whole

On the page directly following the one just discussed we find two ground plans, one above the other (Fig. 5).[10] The drawings are concerned with spatial organization and show on one level the interconnections of vaults, pillars and walls. Starting at the central point of the choir circle, which corresponds to the position of the keystone in the inner apse, both drawings are constructed according to an accurate geometry. The upper plan, which in the caption is referred to as an invention,[11] is made up of seven sections of a fourteen-part circle, while the lower, depicting the choir of Meaux Cathedral, shows five sections of a ten-part circle. The lines of the inner apses extend outwards in a radial manner and determine the position of the pillars and wall responds in the ambulatory as well as the length of the half bay, which adjoins the first straight bay of the choir. The upper drawing shows a double ambulatory with chapels alternating in depth and shape, whereas the lower plan depicts a similar ambulatory with three equal chapels arranged around it.

The didactic quality in the juxtaposition of both choir plans is hard to ignore. Above, the double ambulatory, with its continuous ring of chapels – the square ones attached to it, the round ones drawn into it – forms a choir of complex and multiple spaces. In the drawing below, by contrast, the

[9] Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt*, p. 67, providing the original text "ensi com il ist d(e) tierre".

[10] Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt*, pl. 29, p. 69.

[11] For details, see Wolfgang Schenkluhn, "Inter se disputando: Erwin Panofsky zum Zusammenhang von gotischer Architektur und Scholastik", in *Gestalt, Funktion, Bedeutung: Festschrift für Friedrich Möbius zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz A. Jäger & Helga Sciurie, Jena, 1999, p. 93-100.

three identical polygonal chapels circulate around the simple ambulatory like satellites, with the wide intervals between them corresponding to the wide positioning of the columns of the inner apse. In every detail the two figures relate to one another as alternatives, demonstrating a broad set of variations. Here we have a contrast not between the typical and the actual, between a schema and a particular building; instead, the similarly drawn figures have the character of plans ("plan" not in the sense of a model, which can be directly converted into reality, but in the sense of a *dispositio*, which can give proper expression to two opposing architectural ideas in two coherent figures). The drawings – the upper apparently the product of a discussion between two architects – are not so much technical exercises as vehicles for the clarification and presentation of architectural ideas.

Fig. 5 Villard de Honnecourt, chevet plan of Meaux Cathedral and an invention of a choir, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS fr 19093 (after Hans R. Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt*, Graz 1972, pl. 29)

The juxtaposition of both choirs is animated by a fundamental difference, which the caption only appears to allude to: "You can see here the ground plan of the church of St Stephen at Meaux. Above it is a church with a double ambulatory, 'found' by Villard and Peter of Corbie".[12] Art historical classification does indeed recognize the category of the choir surrounded by an ambulatory, furthermore differentiating between various kinds of elevations, and between basilican and hall ambulatories; however, the number of aisles plays no essential role in this taxonomy. For Villard, on the other hand, the number of aisles appears to have been a crucial distinguishing feature.

If we apply Villard's criterion to the history of Gothic architecture in France, then his distinction turns out to be amply justified. Right from the outset the first buildings of the early Gothic, the royal abbey church of St Denis near Paris and the archiepiscopal cathedral of Sens, are distinguished by this criterion (Fig. 6). At St Denis we have a double ambulatory with a complete, drawn-in crown of chapels derived from an inner apse of seven parts of a duodecagon; at Sens we have a wider 5/10 apse with a simple, single ambulatory and a large, rectangular axial chapel. The choir ground plans of Saint-Denis and Sens are thus identical in structure to the two choirs juxtaposed by Villard in Fig. 5.

[12] Hahnloser, *Villard de Honnecourt*, p. 72: "une glize a double charole".

Fig. 6 Paris, Saint-Denis Abbey (above) and Sens Cathedral (below), comparative plans of their chevets (Wolfgang Schenkluhn)

Historically, the choirs of Saint-Denis and Sens were reciprocally related and mutually competitive conceptions. Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis sought to transform his new choir, already the mausoleum of French kings, into the central shrine of the French crown, while the patron of Sens, the reforming Archbishop Henri Sanglier, claimed primacy over the bishops of France.[13] It is therefore not surprising to discover that in the leading building projects that followed, for example the choirs of the cathedrals of Paris, Bourges and Chartres, both these "distinguished" and "praiseworthy" choir schemata formed the inspiration for ever more ingenious syntheses. These schemata decisively shaped the course of Gothic architecture in the French royal domains.

The meaning of the choir in the Middle Ages

Villard's ground plans also represent the choir parts in a liturgical sense. The farthest he extends his drawing into the space of the nave is in the church "according to the square", and here he extends it up to that point where the monk's stalls were usually positioned. In all of the other plans the drawing terminates immediately behind the crossing, the site of the high altar. Despite this curtailment, however, it is important to realize that all of these drawings are referred to in the captions as churches. That is, the choir, which comprises chapels, ambulatory and inner apse, sanctuary, crossing and transepts, is the *pars pro toto* for the entire church. Its complex structure, which Villard vertically positions onto the page (just like a human head), was clearly the most essential part of the church.

In terms of structural design and engineering, the choir was clearly the most important part of the Gothic church. Moreover, the choir also encapsulated the most significant functional and symbolic space of a church building; this is suggested, among other things, by the early history of the Gothic choir itself. At the beginning stands the choir of St Denis, to which a new nave was attached a hundred years later; the endpoint is marked by the colossal choir of Beauvais, to which a nave was never added (Fig. 7). In the decades between these two projects we also encounter a number of "nave-less" churches – new choirs whose construction was not followed by a rebuilding of the nave. The raising of choirs obviously had priority. They often consumed so much money that there was nothing left for further construction. The extent to which the choir preoccupied the imagination of the period is shown in a chapel whose forms are closely related to the inner choir of a Gothic cathedral – a chapel which, like the ground plans of Villard, represents in the sense of a *pars pro toto* the whole of the church. This is

[13] On both of these figures, see Otto Von Simson, *The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order*, New York, 1962.

Fig. 7 Beauvais Cathedral, Basse Œuvre (photo Wolfgang Schenkluhn)

Fig. 8 Florence, Santa Croce, choir (photo Wolfgang Schenkluhn)

of course the famous palace chapel of King Louis IX, the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris, a brilliant architectural abbreviation of a cathedral,[14] which exercised a profound influence on Gothic architecture, and which was conceived and built exactly during the period when Villard was drawing his ground plan.

Turning to the nave

The importance of the ground plan schema and of the choir for high medieval church architecture is diametrically opposed to modern definitions of medieval building types, which derive from the elevation of the nave. So when and how did this change of outlook, this redirection of focus to the nave, take place? In what follows I offer a few, short observations.

The change of focus occurred during the late Middle Ages. Important contributing factors to this shift of emphasis include changes in building practice, changes in the design and perception of churches, as well as a new interest in classical Antiquity. The churches of the friars played a leading role in this process, particularly around 1300 and in Italy; in these monumental buildings the choir space was transformed into choir walls, catering to a new need for visibility.[15] One of the most beautiful edifices testifying to this trend is the Franciscan church of Santa Croce in Florence (Fig. 8).

The transformation of the choir into what may be called pictorial architecture coincided with significant changes in the representation of architecture in painting. Just like the pictorially organized walls of these choirs, with their perspectives attuned to interior space, the painter opened up the flat picture plane through an architecture shaped by spatial depth. The rows of arcades running parallel to the picture plane, so characteristic of the early Middle Ages, were transformed, in the years around 1300 and especially in the paintings by Giotto, into palpable spaces with verifiable dimensions. An early example of the basilican cross-section in painting can be found in a mural by a pupil of Giotto, Taddeo Gaddi's Presentation of the Virgin from the Baroncelli Chapel of Santa Croce in Florence. The Temple of Jerusalem is placed here diagonally into the pictorial field, and depicted as a delicate and open ecclesiastical structure consisting of just a few bays around the high altar in front of the small apse (Fig. 9).

[14] Wolfgang Schenkluhn, *Ordines Studentes*, Berlin, 1985, p. 201-203, 224-227.

[15] Wolfgang Schenkluhn, *Architektur der Bettelorden: Die Baukunst der Dominikaner und Franziskaner in Europa*, Darmstadt, 2000, p. 177-182.

The shift towards a more axial, less oblique, view into the choir takes place in fifteenth-century painting, particularly in connection with the use of single-point perspective.[16] This trend is exemplified by Jan van Eyck's Virgin in the Church, in which the Mother of God can be seen standing in the eastern bay of a nave in front of an open rood screen; a second case in point is a painting of the Holy Family in a church, attributed to Konrad Witz (circa 1440), which seems to anticipate a more modern viewpoint. A logically consistent development of this angle of vision can be found in the frescoes of the St Nicholas Chapel in the Vatican, painted by Fra Angelico between 1447 and1450.

These innovations were dependent, at least in part, on new developments in church architecture. In central Europe the complex layout of the choir with ambulatory was simplified during the course of the fourteenth century. Such choirs also suffered a decline in numbers. Instead, there appeared single-aisled or apsidal choir solutions, so that late examples of the ambulatory choir, for example in the cathedrals of Prague or Milan, already have a retrospective quality. In Italy, with its shift towards classical Antiquity, Roman buildings became the paradigm of Christian church architecture. Filippo Brunelleschi's new church of San Lorenzo in Florence provides an early example of this trend. It is only when we turn to the ground plan of this church that we can still recognize a medieval schema (Fig. 10). The antique-looking basilican elevation clearly emulates the Early Christian tradition. Church building projects of this period rejected complicated choir solutions and, whenever their architects were not showing a preference for centralized structures, they turned their attention to problems of nave and façade design. Alberti's re-shaping of the façade of Santa Maria Novella in Florence and his new work at S. Andrea in Mantua are, in this context, of seminal importance.

Fig. 9 Taddeo Gaddi, Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple, Florence, Santa Croce, Baroncelli Chapel (Wolfgang Schenkluhn)

Fig. 10 Florence, S. Spirito, ground plan (Reclams-Kunstführer, *Florenz und Fiesole*, Stuttgart, 1975, p. 302)

Alberti's architectural treatise, the first since Vitruvius,[17] is concerned not with ground plan schemata and church choirs but with building types such as the temple and the basilica. These struc-

[16] Samuel Y. Edgerton, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*, New York, 1975.

[17] Leon Battista Alberti, *Zehn Bücher über die Baukunst*, transl. Max Theurer, Darmstadt, 1975.

tures are defined by their elevations, and from now on their "choirs" are no more than small apses. In architectural theory, as in contemporary painting and architecture, the perceptual shift from choir to nave takes place before our eyes.

Conclusion

The change represented by what can broadly be called the Renaissance provided the conditions for our modern taxonomy of architectural types. This taxonomy emerged during the post-Napoleonic period, when medieval monuments were being 'rediscovered' and restored, and when theoretical discussions of ecclesiastical architecture accompanied the building of new churches for the growing number of different religious denominations. At the same time older notions of church architecture were being successively phased out. In Goethe's early days no one knew what a hall church was, or understood that the essential qualities of the centralized building were considered more important than those of the basilica. Christian Karl Bunsen was the first scholar to discover, sometime around 1820, that the Early Christian basilica furnished the basic prototype for most subsequent western church buildings (Fig.11).[18] But it was not until 1853 that Wilhelm Lübke (building on a remark by Carl Schnaase) coined the term "hall church", in order to distinguish this type of building from the basilica.[19]

Fig. 11 Rome, S. Paolo, engraving after Bunsen (Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen, *Die Basiliken des christlichen Roms*, Munich, 1842)

The shift in emphasis towards the nave, its alignment and the general elements of its elevation, occasioned a corresponding shift in art historical classification, which now likewise became focused on the nave.

By contrast, as we have seen in the architectural drawings of Villard de Honnecourt, the high Middle Ages placed the choir, and not the nave, at the centre of its interests, in terms both of planning and construction. At the same time, the figure of the ground plan enjoyed a much higher status than is today generally admitted. It was precisely the ground plan that provided one of the first tools for a proper understanding of architectural typology. Of course, the importance attached to the design and construction of choirs by their high medieval builders and audiences did not imply that the nave had no significance during this period. The nave and choir together constituted necessary and complementary parts of the church, although the nave clearly assumed a secondary role. It was the choir figure or choir form that distinguished the church, while also determining the shape of the nave in a variety of ways. Of course, Villard's interest in the choir ground plan as a tool for designing and shaping the Gothic church still raises a number of questions. I would like to close with the observation that

[18] Christian Karl BUNSEN, *Die Basiliken des christlichen Roms, nach ihrem Zusammenhange mit Idee und Geschichte der Kirchenbaukunst*, Munich, 1819.

[19] Wolfgang SCHENKLUHN, "Die Erfindung der Hallenkirche in der Kunstgeschichte", in *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, 22, 1989, p. 193-202.

a historically adequate understanding of ecclesiastical architecture in the Middle Ages should always be rooted in a discussion of medieval notions of architectural forms and structures. Without this historical understanding our conventional typologies are bound to remain formal conceptual frameworks. Future research would certainly benefit from a more thorough historical-critical investigation of the technical terms used to describe architectural forms during the Middle Ages.

Acknowledgements

This paper was first given as lecture at the invitation of Paul Crossley at the Courtauld Institute of Art in 1997; a shorter version has been published as "Die Grundrissfiguren im Bauhüttenbuch des Villard de Honnecourt", in *Hallesche Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte*, 7, 2005, p. 103-120.

Imitatio in Gothic Architecture: Forms *versus* Procedures

Christian Freigang

What is imitation?

Questioning the topic of imitation in Gothic architecture appears to be a somewhat bizarre project since it is well-known that "imitation" or even the complete "copying" of "models" belongs to the specific characteristics of Gothic architecture between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. Furthermore, the qualities of the transfer of forms and their meaning have been categorized and discussed extensively.[1] And indeed, it can hardly be denied that complex architectural solutions have been transferred from one region to another and that they therefore constitute a very important factor of "progress", "innovation" and "transformation" in the historiography of medieval architecture. The design of the towers of Laon Cathedral, for example, is adapted at Bamberg and Naumburg in the 1230s, while Villard de Honnecourt glorifies them at the same time as unique and beautiful. Cologne Cathedral aimed to emulate Amiens and was itself imitated – at least partially – at Altenberg, Augsburg, and Prague. The Sainte-Chapelle in Vincennes is a true copy of its pendant in Paris. Further examples could easily be added. Reconstructing and interpreting the close formal relationships between these different medieval buildings is the core feature of a historiographical method based primarily on the analysis of forms. Among the central goals of this method are a better understanding of the itineraries of medieval workmen and the organization of their ateliers, and the interpretation of the symbolic meanings of Gothic architecture, particularly in view of its putative "imitation" of theological models. In this latter regard we are especially indebted to Paul Crossley, who has incisively – and ironically – criticized some of the more doubtful approaches of this hermeneutic method.[2]

It also needs to be stressed that the discussion of the kinds of formal analogies briefly made above remains an act of modern description which is full of vague and/or interpretative terms such as "to adopt", "to cite", "to vary", "to be related", "to serve as model", "to influence", and so on. These terms have a range of connotations, but there is one significant aspect which they generally fail to denote: formal analogies between buildings are always the result of a specific historical act, which aims to create a very particular relationship – or tension – between the prototype and its later "copy" or off-spin. The explanation of formal references thus seems to be obvious *prima facie*, though in most of the cases the precise historical circumstances are unknown. Nevertheless, the connotations with which these terms are invested and which draw often voluntary, even programmatic connections between a given number of buildings do not free us from the responsibility of adequately reconstructing or representing a specific historic reality. Moreover, in what sense can a formal relationship be interpreted at all? Is a formal relationship a concrete reference to the imitated building, or to the architectural idiom of, or anecdotal associations with that building? Can morphological similarities in architecture convey precise spiritual, political or dynastic messages, just as heraldic devices do? And if so, can these messages be understood as semantic units or terms that are combined to form a sort of complex text – a

[1] Dieter Kimpel & Robert Suckale, *Die gotische Architektur in Frankreich 1130 – 1270*, Munich, 1985; Hans-Joachim Kunst, *Die Kathedrale in Reims: Architektur als Schauplatz politischer Bedeutungen,* Frankfurt a., M., 1988; Matthias Müller, *Der zweitürmige Westbau der Marburger Elisabethkirche: Die Vollendung der Grabeskirche einer "königlichen Frau"; Baugeschichte, Vorbilder, Bedeutung*, Marburg, 1997.

[2] Paul Crossley, "Medieval Architecture and Meaning: the Limits of Iconography", in *The Burlington Magazine,* 130, 1988, p. 116-121.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100149

text that modern viewers can decipher as a series of stable cognitive codes, signalling, for instance, a complex network of political dependencies? In this essay I will question the notion of "imitation" as a modern heuristic device for analysing formal analogies. I will stress the historic signification of imitation as the deliberate repetition not only of forms, but of exemplary facts or acts. In this sense, "imitation" refers to a theological model which since the age of humanism has functioned as a central category of representing the world in art and literature.[3] As a referential category, "imitation" plays a particularly important role in theology and rhetoric, for it helps reconcile and bridge the gap between the present and the distant creation of the universe. In architecture, too, "imitation" is a multi-layered and essential term. For the purposes of this essay it might still be useful to apply to Gothic architecture the three different notions of "imitation" found in antique rhetoric. These notions comprise, firstly, *imitatio naturae*, which designates the artistic imitation of reality; secondly, *imitatio auctorum*, the imitation of exemplary works of poetry and art; and thirdly, *imitatio morum* or the imitation of ideal acts and attitudes. In this vein, we might look at a Gothic church as a reference to the Temple of Solomon or to a celestial architectural archetype (*imitatio auctorum*), while late Gothic ornament could be read as competing with nature and its vegetal forms (*imitatio naturae*). Where then does *imitatio morum* come in and inform our understanding of Gothic architecture?

Did building programmes impose models to be imitated?

Concerning putative prototypes and their imitation in architecture, the written sources remain rather silent, even in periods during which the quasi-international transfer of forms reaches its peak. In French architecture, the decades around 1300 are sometimes characterized by the term "doctrinaire rayonnant", which refers to an astonishing conceptual and stylistic homogeneity across various ambitious projects realized in geographically very distant regions. Thus, the buildings of Normandy, the Auvergne and the Languedoc, as well as of the Île-de-France at this time show remarkable similarities in their general disposition, which include both the classical cathedral scheme and specific stylistic features. For instance, the north and south portals of Rouen Cathedral are decorated with refined blind arcades and medallions (Fig. 1). The same forms reappear on the north portal of Bordeaux Cathedral, on the west portals of Lyon Cathedral, and on the entrance to the Great Chapel of Clement V at the Papal Palace at Avignon (Fig. 2).[4] These stylistic repetitions can hardly be thought of as representing a meaningful system of references. It seems to make more sense to interpret these recurrences as the result of the activities of an itinerant workman or workshop. And yet, the overall designs of the four portals are so vastly different from each other that it is unlikely that they were all created by a single master; it is more probable that the forms found on the portals were drawn from a readily and widely available repertoire of standardized decorative elements the details of which could also be applied to other parts of a given building project. According to recent research carried out by Markus Schlicht,

[3] Nicola Kaminski, "Imitatio auctorum", in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. Gert Ueding, vol. 4, cols. 235-285; Dina De Rentiis, "Imitatio morum", in *ibidem*, col. 285-303; Dina De Rentiis, *Die Zeit der Nachfolge: Zur Interdependenz von "imitatio Christi" und "imitatio auctorum" im 12.-16. Jahrhundert* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 273), Tübingen, 1996; Martin L. McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo,* Oxford, 1995; Alexandru N. Cizek, *Imitatio et tractatio: Die literarisch-rhetorischen Grundlagen der Nachahmung in Antike und Mittelalter*, Tübingen, 1994.

[4] Markus Schlicht, "Pour la plus grande gloire de l'archevêque: L'architecture de la cathédrale de Rouen sous Guillaume de Flavacourt", in *Revue de l'art*, 138/4, 2002, p. 5-18; Markus Schlicht, "Imitation et rejet de l'architecture francilienne dans un édifice du Sud-Ouest: le portail nord de la cathédrale de Bordeaux", in *Revue archéologique de Bordeaux*, 92, 2001, p. 69-88; Markus Schlicht, *Un chantier majeur de la fin du Moyen Âge: la cathédrale de Rouen vers 1300. Portail des Libraires, portail de la Calende, chapelle de la Vierge* (Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie, 41), Caen, 2005, esp. p. 133-179.

Fig. 1 Rouen Cathedral, north transept portal, after 1281, detail of the dado (photo Markus Schlicht)

Fig. 2 Avignon, Papal Palace, portal of the Great Chapel, circa 1350 (photo Markus Schlicht)

the invention of such exemplary pools of innovative forms took place in highly developed ateliers, while it was largely the mobility of the clergy that ensured that these ateliers were in demand across huge geographical distances. The goal of these enterprises was not to create networks of symbol-laden "quotations", but to realize and "show off" the latest and most refined architectural forms.

The transfer of these new forms was much facilitated by architectural drawings, which were now being widely used. In this context it is interesting to note that the important collections of medieval drawings – at Strasbourg, Ulm, and particularly Vienna – are in many ways as eclectic as the 'accidental' images in Villard de Honnecourt's famous *carnet* of drawings. These collections thus present us with a seemingly random assortment of ground plans, vaulting projects, tabernacle elevations, and so on. Despite this lack of order, however, these drawings contain a huge amount of information, for instance on the proportions of a ground plan or an elevation, on specific design procedures or moulding profiles and so on, which a specialized workman could easily access. But even where drawings show buildings and monuments that had actually been projected and/or constructed, as in the Vienna collection, they should not be compared to a kind of textbook of world architecture; rather, they ought to be understood as compilations of anonymous model designs for the construction of especially bold edifices. It would be most useful to know how exactly these collections were initially organized, particularly in the case of Vienna.[5] The fact that nearly none of the drawings is identified by a topographic name certainly implies that the collections were not arranged according to an order established by particular buildings. It seems indeed that knowing just what building was depicted in a given drawing was of secondary importance. Of course the drawings may have served as an important basis for preliminary discussions between patron and mason, but to my knowledge no drawing was favoured over another because it showed a famous and well-known edifice (as was indeed the case in nineteenth-century historicist architectural practice).

[5] Hans Josef Böker, *Architektur der Gotik: Bestandskatalog der weltgrößten Sammlung an gotischen Baurissen (Legat Franz Jäger) im Kupferstichkabinett der Akademie der Bildenden Künste Wien; mit einem Anhang über die mittelalterlichen Bauzeichnungen im Wiener Museum Karlsplatz*, Salzburg, 2005.

Fig. 3 Mons, Archives de l'Etat, drawing of the ground plan of an "ideal" church, circa 1449 (modern reconstruction) (after Klaus Jan Philipp, *Sainte-Waudru in Mons*, Munich & Berlin, 1988)

A case in point is Sainte-Waudru in Mons (Hainault), a collegiate church for canonesses studied by Klaus Jan Philipp.[6] In 1449, one "Meistre Michel de Reims", who had previously worked at Cambrai and Valenciennes, was commissioned to design and oversee the construction of the new church. For this purpose he drew at least two ground plans, which today are preserved in the National Archives at Mons. The first of these plans shows a bizarre pastiche of several well-known architectural elements derived from a number of very different models (Fig. 3). The radiating chapels are thus borrowed from Orléans Cathedral; the plan of the choir apse brings to mind that of Clermont-Ferrand Cathedral; the relatively narrow nave is similar to that of Reims Cathedral; while the sacristy next to the choir refers to an analogous feature at Cologne Cathedral. The second of Michel de Reims' drawings, however, is conceptually altogether different (Fig. 4). Instead of a collage of different elements this plan faithfully reproduces the ground plan of Amiens Cathedral as it appeared in the late fourteenth century. Neither project was eventually realized, perhaps, as Philipp has surmised, because they were simply too ambitious for the specific needs of the canonesses. We can certainly conclude from the fact that because Michel de Reims was at liberty to come up with these two radically different designs the overall parameters of the building programme must have been rather vague. Presumably this programme was limited to some functional and liturgical aspects (such as the topography of altars and ceremonies), but gave little attention to matters of architectural form or the imitation of one morphologically authoritative or meaningful model. As a workman from Flanders Michel de Reims would have been very familiar with the Cathedral of Amiens; however, for him, this building mattered because of its architectural ambition, not because it held any particular political significance.

[6] Klaus Jan PHILIPP, "Sainte-Waudru in Mons (Bergen, Hennegau): Die Planungsgeschichte einer Stiftskirche 1449 – 1450", in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 51, 1988, p. 372 – 413.

Fig. 4 Mons, Archives de l'Etat (see Fig. 3), drawing of the ground plan of Amiens Cathedral, circa 1449 (modern reconstruction) (after Klaus Jan Philipp, *Sainte-Waudru in Mons*, Munich & Berlin, 1988)

With the exception of some minor profane buildings (such as bridges) the vast majority of Gothic construction projects did not require their architects to precisely reproduce the formal characteristics of a given prototype. In those cases where formal models were to be copied, the phrase *ad modum et formam* is occasionally used.[7]

In his famous article on medieval architectural copies Richard Krautheimer convincingly demonstrated that the historic notions of "copy" and "exemplar" do not suffice as modern hermeneutic categories.[8] Without contemporary written sources we can only guess at the intended meaning of most buildings. Interestingly those tiny referential hints on exemplary models become rarer the more we move forward in the history of medieval architecture. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries it was fairly common for authors to draw attention to the exemplary role of a building such as the Palatine Chapel in Aachen,[9] though later writings are often devoid of these kinds of references. To try to define the medieval notions of "model", "copy" or "imitation" in morphological terms is therefore an almost futile exercise.

King Solomon's exemplarity: What is an ideal builder?

Building programmes as described in panegyrical "initiator texts" of the Gothic period are much more focused on the logistics of building administration than on the issue of exemplary models. In the *harenga* of the foundation charter of the new Benedictine Abbey Church of Saint Ouen in Rouen Abbot Jean Roussel provides us with several reasons why from 1321 onwards a new campaign of construction had become necessary. The physical building was thus envisaged as a representation of the salvation-bearing *ecclesia militans*. Among the conceptual precursors for this project was the Tabernacle of Moses. Later it was David who initiated the building of the Temple of Jerusalem, even though

[7] Günter Binding, *Der früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bauherr als sapiens architectus,* Darmstadt, 1996, p. 345-367.

[8] Richard Krautheimer, "Introduction to an 'Iconography' of Medieval Architecture", in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 5, 1942, p. 1-33.

[9] Albert Verbeek, "Die architektonische Nachfolge der Aachener Pfalzkapelle", in *Karl der Große: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, ed. Wolfgang Braunfels, vol. 4, Düsseldorf, 1965^{2}, p. 113-156.

wars temporarily brought its construction to a halt. The magnificent Temple was finally completed under David's son Solomon, who very much profited from the prudent financial arrangements made by his father. Abbot Roussel continues to reason that if these Jewish rulers, still living under the Mosaic Law, had been able to construct such ambitious buildings, then Christians, blessed by the light of Truth, should also *facere Deo gratas basilicas et ornatas*.[10] Without doubt Roussel considered himself the successor of the wise architect Solomon, and perhaps even thought to outdo him. In the following passages, the charter provides a summary of the well-organized logistics of the new construction project. We thus find a list of available financial funds, but also a paragraph which states that after having gained the unanimous approval of the chapter Roussel embarked on finding and assigning the best specialists to realize the construction project.

We encounter a similar line of reasoning in one of the necrologies for Emperor Charles IV, written in 1378 by Jan Očko of Vlašim, Archbishop of Prague: the Emperor is not only Solomon's successor, but also his competitor; Charles exceeds his mythical ancestor in wisdom, and his newly-built cathedral in Prague, with its gold-glittering lustre, surpasses the Old Testament Temple.[11] Upon closer reading we find that Archbishop Jan's panegyric concentrates on the logistic, administrative and financial merits of Charles' building project, and in this the text can be likened to the memorial of the cathedral founders in the famous triforium gallery of St Vitus, in which the donors (Charles, his dynasty, the archbishops) and the administrators and architects (Matthew of Arras and Peter Parler) are, as it were, reassembled.[12]

In its representation of the ruler as builder Archbishop Jan's necrology can also be compared to Christine de Pisan's panegyric of Charles V, King of France. It evokes the sheer magnificence of Charles's building projects, which far surpasses that of the edifices constructed under Ahasuerus, Solomon, and Alexander. By referring to these mythical authorities, Christine praises the king's personal investment in public welfare and his exemplary activities, but not at all his personal taste for good and new architectural forms.[13]

Another example of this kind of writing and reasoning is a well-known passage from the *Chronicle* of the Collegiate Church of Wimpfen im Tal, written in circa 1300, thirty years after the reconstruction of the church. (Fig. 5) The document states that the new building work was carried out under the aegis of Deacon Richard of Deidesheim, and with the participation of a workman from Paris, *peritissimo architectoriae artis.* Furthermore, the design for both the inside and outside of the church is said to be in the French manner (*opere francigeno*), using precisely cut ashlar stones (*ex sectis lapidibus*) and sumptuous decoration.[14] Over the past decades scholars have interpreted the famous dictum

[10] Rouen, Archives départementales de la Seine-Maritime, 14 H 439 (12 December 1321), cf. Peter Seyfried, *Die ehemalige Abteikirche Saint-Ouen in Rouen*, Weimar, 2002, p. 100-101; Michael T. Davis, "Sic et Non: Recent Trends in the Study of Gothic Ecclesiastical Architecture", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 58, 1999, p. 414-423, here p. 421; Jules Quicherat, "Documents inédits sur la construction de Saint-Ouen de Rouen", in *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole de Chartes*, 3, 1852, p. 464-476.

[11] *Fontes rerum bohemicarum*, ed. Josef Emler, Prague, vol. 3, 1882-1884, p. 427.

[12] Christian Freigang, "Werkmeister als Stifter: Bemerkungen zur Tradition der Prager Baumeisterbüsten", in *Nobilis arte manus: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Antje Middeldorf Kosegarten*, ed. Bruno Klein & Harald Wolter - von dem Knesebeck, Dresden & Kassel, 2002, p. 244-264.

[13] Wolfgang Brückle, *Civitas terrena: Staatsrepräsentation und politischer Aristotelismus in der französischen Kunst 1270-1380,* Munich & Berlin, 2005, here p. 166-199.

[14] [*Richardus de Ditensheim, decanus ...*] *accitoque peritissimo architectoriae artis latomo, qui tunc noiter de villa Parisiensi e partibus venerat Franciae, opere francigeno basilicam ex sectis lapidibus construi jubet: idem vero artifex, mirabilis architecturae basilicam yconis sanctorum intus et exterius ornatissime distinctam fenstras et columnas ad instar anaglifici operis multo sudore et sumptuosis ffecerat expensis, cisut usque hodie in praesens humano visui apparet. Populis itaque undique advenientibus, mirantur tam opus egregium, laudant artificem, venerantur Dei servum Richardum gaudent se eum vidisse, nomenque ejus longe lateque portatur* (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, 30/1), p. 666 ; Victor Mortet & Paul Deschamps, *Recueil des textes relatifs á l'histoire de l'architecture ... en France au Moyen Age, XIIe- XIIIe siècles,* Paris, 1929, n° 142.

Fig. 5 Wimpfen im Tal, Collegiate Church, circa 1270 (photo Christian Freigang)

of *opus francigenum* as a medieval stylistic term that was coined to refer to both French Rayonnant Gothic and high-level technical skills.[15] However, a closer look at Wimpfen's collegiate church reveals that this particular reading of the term is in fact problematic, as neither the technique, nor the style, nor the conceptual design of the building are especially French. We can make more sense of the chronicle's narrative if we focus on its underlying panegyrical agenda; the topos of cut stones and the term of *anaglyphum opus* are thus used in the Bible to describe outstanding buildings, especially Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem.[16] Even more so, as a passage following the narrative of the reconstruction of the church indicates, Richard of Deidesheim's building activities are themselves likened to the venerable acts of the wise ruler and architect Solomon. The abbot is implicitly honoured here as a *sapiens architectus* who has reformed the entire collegiate foundation. For this reason Richard merits to be venerated as one of the *donatores seu fundatores*.

It is important to bear in mind that none of the four texts discussed dwell on the objective morphological architectural features of the buildings they purport to describe. In those cases in which they seem to do so – as at Wimpfen – the descriptive terms are in fact borrowed from biblical sources and have little to do with the newly constructed church. What the writings do emphasize is that Solomon should be imitated in his double capacity as a wise builder and logistical expert.

Despite the fact that references to Solomon were quite common from the ninth century onwards,[17] the passages we have analysed should by no means be understood as being merely of decorative nature. Surely, someone like Deacon Richard would rather have been remembered for being justly rewarded by God during the Last Judgment for having followed the model of his biblical ancestors than for some pragmatic stylistic inventions that benefited his building projects. What would have mattered in the end was *imitatio morum*, not *imitatio operis* or *imitatio auctorum*.

The idea of *imitatio morum* was first developed in the Epistles (2 Thessalonians 7; 3 John 11); somewhat later, the lives and deeds of the apostles and saints were likewise deemed worthy of imitation. These models of imitation were supposed to ensure the unity and continuity of *Ecclesia* and all its members. The patrons of buildings were not only part of this spiritual community, but thanks to their magnificent building activities they continued the holy deeds of their venerated ancestors, giving visual expression to the concept of *Ecclesia* as both a metaphorical and earthly embodiment of the Church. The founder of an ambitious construction project can thus be regarded as the main person committing a multiplicity of good deeds, including those of financing, logistical organization, and the choice of both a suitable architect and a meaningful model to be imitated. The last point could refer to *imitatio auctorum*, but is clearly subordinated to *imitatio morum*: in the case of Wimpfen the chronicler mentions the Parisian provenance of the master mason to point out that Richard acted as wisely and as virtuously as Solomon. In this context *opus francigenum* does not so much refer to a stylistic description. Rather, *opus francigenum* denotes a "quality label" that emphasizes the excellence of Richard of Deidesheim's planning activity.

[15] Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations through Eight Centuries*, Princeton, 1960, p. 55-57; Heinrich Klotz, *Der Ostbau der Stiftskirche Wimpfen im Tal: Zum Frühwerk des Erwin von Steinbach,* Munich & Berlin, 1967, p. 17-18; Peter Kurmann, "Opus francigenum: Überlegungen zur Rezeption französischer Vorbilder in der deutschen Architektur und Skulptur des 13. Jahrhunderts anhand des Beispiels von Wimpfen im Tal", in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vergleichende Kunstforschung in Wien*, 33, 1981, p. 1-4; Günther Binding, "Opus Francigenum: Ein Beitrag zur Begriffsbestimmung", in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 71, 1989, p. 45-54.

[16] See 3 Kings 6, 7, esp. 3 Kings 7:12 (*lapidibus sectis*) and 3 Kings 6:32 (*anaglypha valde prominentia*). The term is frequent in medieval ekphrastic writings; see Otto Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Schriftquellen zur Kunstgeschichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts für Deutschland, Lothringen und Italien,* vol. 2, Berlin, 1938, p. 228 ; Otto Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Lateinische Schriftquellen zur Kunst in England, Wales und Schottland vom Jahre 901 bis zum Jahre 1307* (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte, 1), vol. 5, Munich, 1960, p. 20.

[17] Binding, *Der früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bauherr*, here p. 337-344.

Notable forms or exemplary acts?

As is well-known, references to the exemplary acts of local saints or of much venerated dynastic predecessors could be profitably used for political purposes. Seen in this context, building projects, through their deliberate choice of liturgical dispositions, were not so much an expression of taste but of political agendas. Once more, the cathedral of St Vitus is instructive here. As Paul Crossley has shown, there are a number of close conceptual parallels between the cathedrals of Krakow and Prague, both constructed during the fourteenth century. At Krakow, the new cathedral, begun in 1320, was from the very beginning calibrated to host and augment the coronation ceremonies of the new Piast dynasty. This is suggested both by the proximity of the cathedral to the royal palace, and by the enlargement of the south transept, with its porch and eastern chapel, as well as by the strategic placement of the tomb of St Stanislas into the crossing, close to the altar of the Holy Cross – all features that were subsequently adopted by Charles IV in his reconstruction plans for Prague Cathedral and his re-choreographed coronation ceremony for the Bohemian kings.[18] It is important to note that none of these acts of imitation had any ramifications on the stylistic front. While Krakow Cathedral remained indebted to local traditions, the new building on the Hradčany was to follow western architectural models.

The kind of "patterning" that we can observe in Charles's designs for Prague Cathedral has parallels elsewhere, for instance in two building projects initiated by the house of Anjou in the county of Provence and the kingdom of Naples. The architectural patronage of this dynasty, established during the 1270s, provides us with a perfect laboratory for the study of architectural policy. Both Charles II (1288 – 1309) and Robert the Wise (1309 – 1343) took a keen interest in transforming their respective political centres at Aix-en-Provence and Naples. They thus strongly supported the mendicant orders in both towns, attempted to establish universities at St Maximin and Naples, and encouraged the veneration of two local saints, Mary Magdalene in Provence and Gennaro in Naples. Again, despite the obvious parallels between these activities, which also significantly affected the architectural sector, there were no noticeable stylistic repercussions. The two main buildings of the house of Anjou, the great Blackfriars Church of Saint-Maximin-La-Sainte-Baume in Provence (begun 1295, Fig. 6) and the gigantic Clarissan Church of Santa Chiara in Naples (begun 1317, Fig. 7) have nothing in common, except perhaps for their austere looks and design. Saint-Maximin, with its three aisles, presents itself as a somewhat outdated northern French basilica, while Santa Chiara, with its enormous, un-vaulted single nave, is a southern Italian mendicant church on steroids. Despite their structural differences, however, both churches are architectural manifestoes of poverty, and in this they correspond to the notions of dynastic power and representation that the Anjou had inherited from Saint Louis of France.[19] It was thus through their foundation and general architectural disposition rather than through individual formal motifs that both buildings became signifiers of important political agendas – agendas which had themselves been patterned on that of an exemplary saintly ancestor.

At first glance just the opposite seems to be the case with the cathedral of Narbonne (begun 1272, Fig. 8) – a northern Rayonnant Gothic church transplanted onto southern French soil. In 1354, while the building was still going up, the cathedral chapter declared that it wanted "to imitate the noble and excellently constructed churches which had been built and were yet to be built in the French realm (*regno francie*)"; by doing so, the chapter hoped to "observe the manners and customs of other

[18] Paul Crossley, "*Bohemia sacra* and *Polonia Sacra*: Liturgy and History in Prague and Cracow Cathedrals", in *Folia Historiae Artium*, n. s. 7, 2001, p. 49-69.

[19] Christian Freigang, "Kathedralen als Mendikantenkirchen: Zur politischen Ikonographie der Sakralarchitektur unter Karl I., Karl II. und Robert dem Weisen", in *Medien der Macht: Kunst zur Zeit der Anjous in Italien (Akten der internationalen Tagung im Liebighaus - Museum Alter Plastik. Frankfurt/M. 1997)*, ed. Tanja Michalsky, Berlin, 2001, p. 33-60.

Fig. 6 St-Maximin-la-Sainte-Baume, Blackfriars Church, circa 1295, interior looking east (photo Achim Bednorz, after Christian Freigang, *La Provence. Art, architecture et paysages*, Cologne, 1999)

Fig. 7 Naples, Santa Chiara, begun 1317, interior looking east (after Caroline Bruzelius, *The Stones of Naples: Church Building in Angevin Italy*, 1266-1343, London & New Haven, 2004)

Fig. 8 Narbonne Cathedral (begun 1272) and Archbishop's Palace (photo Christian Freigang)

churches".[20] In addition to this written source the fact that the initiator of the construction was none less than Pope Clement IV (1265 – 1268, formerly Archbishop of Narbonne and counsellor of Louis IX) likewise seemed to suggest that stylistic considerations had a strong impact on the design and intended meaning of the building. But we should be cautious here. Written long after building work had started, the passage quoted above was intended to serve as an apologetic argument in a trial between the chapter and the communal administration, which revolved around the chapter's plans to extend the as yet un-built nave. Had these plans been realized – and thanks to the successful intervention of the commune they were not – parts of the city wall would have been demolished; this in turn would have led to a weakening of the town's defensive capabilities. The commune also complained about the projected towers of the cathedral, which on account of their great height were considered to put the town into serious danger. Seen in light of these grievances, the chapter's statement can hardly be understood as an attempt to explain to the municipality that the style of the cathedral should emu-

[20] Narbonne, Archives municipales, DD, without signature, f° 79r° : *... et non aliu(m) Intendit dictum capitulum facer(e) et capellas noviter construendas et in faciendo imitare* [sic] *eccl(es)ias nobiles et magnific(e) op(er)atas et op(er)a eccl(es)iar(im) que in Regno francie (con)struuntur et sint in p(re)terito Jam constructe (et) (con)suetudinem et modum aliar(um) eccl(esi)arum obs(er)vet vel observare velit in dicta fabrica (con)struenda ...* (Christian Freigang, *Imitare ecclesias nobiles : Die Kathedralen von Narbonne, Toulouse und Rodez und die nordfranzösische Rayonnantgotik im Languedoc*, Worms, 1992, Appendix A 11).

late a French Royal typology, even if modern formal analysis appears to support the opposite. In this context, I would like to draw attention to the term *regnum Francie*, which had been in use since the late thirteenth century to refer not just to northern France, but also to those much more extensive areas over which the king had judicial and executive powers.[21] The chapter members in their statement then appear to claim the right to choose a liturgical layout that was appropriate for their new church and allowed by royal law. In architectural terms, these provisions might well have meant a large cathedral with tall towers and surrounding chapels, though not necessarily one that followed the stylistic idiom of northern French buildings. In fact, so vague and malleable was the chapter's statement that it could also have been used to justify a series of other architectural projects.

More complex notions of imitation came into play during the rebuilding of Westminster Abbey under Henry III, recently studied by Paul Binski. Right from the outset the new residential church of the Plantagenet monarchy (Lady Chapel 1220, choir 1245) was intended to be much more than a copy or pastiche of French High Gothic, for instance the cathedral of Reims, in order to show off a new kind of refined royal taste. To properly understand the new Westminster Abbey, one needs to turn to the imitation of Edward the Confessor, spiritual and ideological role model for Henry III and founder of the preceding church on the site. To give visual expression to this particular brand of *imitatio*, different artistic strategies were pursued. One example of many was the abundant use of Cosmati marble work on the abbey floor, which imbued the royal church with a sense of *romanitas* (and "antiquity" in general), not just in visual terms but *eo ipso* as an aspect of royal policy.[22]

In summary, then, I would like to propose that when we look at imitation in medieval architecture we should not simply limit ourselves to visual memory structures as indicators of political alliances and oppositions. As I have shown, imitation can also mean the *imitatio morum*, in which complex networks of acts and procedures become manifest, visible and saturated with meaning. As we have seen, it was particularly profitable for architectural patrons to imitate spiritual authorities, first and foremost the biblical Solomon, but also medieval and much venerated rulers such as Charlemagne, Louis IX and Edward the Confessor.

How did architectural forms become famous?

Of course the baby should not be thrown out with the bath water. Needless to say that there existed numerous much talked-about and valued buildings already in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries – buildings that could serve as models to be admired, such as the cathedrals of Amiens, Chartres and Paris. However, structures such as these seemed to owe their reputation to their intrinsic architectural features rather than to any political or religious connotations. Witness, for instance, Jean de Jandun, professor at the Collège de Navarre, who in his *Recommentatio Civitatis Parisiensis* of 1323 provides us with a veritable panegyric of the towns of Paris and Senlis.[23] In one passage he describes Notre-Dame's cruciform ground plan and the rose windows of the transepts as outstanding examples of architecture. This shows a remarkable sense for architectural beauty that is not founded in spiritual-biblical, topical or dynastic references, but that seems nearly autonomous.[24]

We find similar such architectural panegyrics in an ekphrastic poem composed in 1451 by Antoine Astesan, secretary to Charles d'Orléans, which describes a number of French localities, includ-

[21] Bernd Schneidmüller, *Nomen Patriae: Die Entstehung Frankreichs in der politsich-geographischen Terminologie (10.-13. Jh.)* (Nationes, 7), Sigmaringen, 1987.

[22] Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power, 1200 – 1400,* New Haven & London, 1995.

[23] Antoine Jean Victor Le Roux de Lincy & Lazare Maurice Tisserand, *Paris et ses historiens aux XIVe et XVe siècles* ... (Histoire générale de Paris. Documents et écrits originaux, 3), Paris, 1867, p. 1-79.

[24] Brückle, *Civitas terrena*, p. 111-116.

ing Paris and Coucy.[25] Particular attention is paid to the Cathedral of Amiens, whose grandeur is emphatically evoked; according to Astesan, the building is not only gigantic, high and magnificent, with good proportions and decorations everywhere; it even managed to so impress some Italian visitors that they began to favour it over the hitherto much admired Cathedral of Milan.

One thing that we should not conclude from the topical reputation of these monuments is that their precise morphology was well-known and somehow formed part of a general iconographic vocabulary. As has been pointed out, these types of architectural exempla were probably developed within specialist discourses which today are difficult to reconstruct. Discussing matters of technical refinement and constructive boldness must have been fairly common among master masons, and resulting from the masons' high degree of mobility and fluctuation certain buildings gained a particular reputation among specialists. This reputation was sometimes more than topical fame, as can be observed in the cases cited above, or in the *Commentarii* of Enea Silvio Piccolomini with their pretended connoisseurship in Austrian architecture.[26] In any case, even within specialised architectural circles communication remained essentially oral, fragmentary and heterogeneous. Thus the creation of a universally accepted canon of meaningful forms largely lay beyond the scope of the medieval architectural discourse, as the extended, but extremely heterogeneous debates surrounding the expertises for Milan Cathedral since the late fourteenth century attest.[27]

In the context of medieval ateliers and lodges a special kind of imitation was however indispensable and everyday practice: to continue a construction meant often and necessarily to copy the initial concept. And within such specialized and hermetic contexts imitation, innovation and alteration gained a precise meaning closely related to the immediate historic situation. An architectural manifestation of this can be seen in the vaults in some rooms in the western aisle of Prague Castle, dating to circa 1400 (Fig. 9). Here, the ribs do not match up with the corbels – they are either too thin for the console below or else begin their ascent next to, instead of on top, of the corbel. The architect appears to have deliberately disregarded all conventions of vault construction, without however endangering the structural integrity of his design, thereby effectively creating a kind of architectural joke. The *imitatio* of traditional working procedures has been transformed here into a creative act of *variatio*, a process that would prepare the ground for the astonishingly bold vaults of Benedikt Ried in the early sixteenth century Bohemia and Silesia.[28] These site-specific solutions were certainly recognized and appreciated as something exceptional, even marvellous. But whether these virtuoso designs managed to penetrate into, and animate, wider discourses on art (as did literary and other artistic works) is doubtful. For an audience beyond that of specialist circles, the western aisle vaults of Prague Castle would have been a sight to behold, though ultimately they would have been devoid of specific meanings or wider artistic relevance and aesthetic merit.

[25] Le Roux & Tisserand, *Paris et ses historiens*, p. 513-577.

[26] Enea Silvio Piccolomini [Pope Pius II], *I Commentarii*, ed. Luigi Totaro, 2 vols., Milan, 1984, II, p. 24.

[27] Christian Freigang, "Was geschah in Mailand? Die Expertisen zum Mailänder Dombau um 1400 und die Vorgeschichte der neuzeitlichen Architekturtheorie", in *Prag und die großen Kulturzentren Europas in der Zeit der Luxemburger (1310-1437). Prague and Great Cultural Centres of Europe in the Luxembourgeois Period (1310–1437). Internationale Konferenz aus Anlaß des 660. Jubiläums der Gründung der Karlsuniversität in Prag, 31. März – 5. April 2008*, ed. Jiři Kuthan & Stefan Scholz (Opera Facultatis Theologiae catholicae Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis: Historia et historia artium, 9), Prague, 2008, p. 427-442.

[28] Stefan Bürger, *Figurierte Gewölbe zwischen Saale und Neisse: Spätgotische Wölbkunst von 1400 bis 1600,* Weimar, 2007.

Fig. 9 Prague Castle, colonnaded room in the western aisle, around 1400 (after Karl Schwarzenberg *et al*., *Der Hradschin. Die Prager Burg und ihre Kunstschätze*, Freiburg, 1992)

Conclusion

In conclusion we can observe that in those cases in which the imitation of exemplary acts stood at the fore, the *imitatio auctorum* was generally subordinate to the *imitatio morum*. Needless to say, both architects and the *concepteurs* of buildings would have had a vested interest in knowing about good and efficient construction techniques, and in their quest for knowledge they would also have sought to adopt innovations from abroad. Whether these specialists were always equally excited about transferring specific sets of meanings through the design of their buildings is, however, doubtful. An architectural detail or quality that may appear to us as a specific, meaning-laden reference to a putative model may in matter of fact have resulted from the more prosaic imitation of technical and logistical procedures and devices. What did matter was to realize an adequate liturgical and functional space and to adopt excellent and virtuoso technical solutions. In doing so architects necessarily needed to refer to other technical solutions – that is to say to imitate and emulate them. But all in all, discussions about the origins and semantic connotations of a given formal solution would have been fairly limited and furthermore would have taken place on a mostly oral level. As the somewhat meagre sources cited above indicate, those discussions were fixed in writing only rarely and not until the later Middle Ages.

It is instructive to compare medieval strategies of imitation to those developed during the Renaissance. If we look at contemporary imitations of Vitruvian prescriptions or antique ruins we notice that these follow in fact another model of *imitatio*, that of literary theory. It is precisely in this period that a universal canon of beauty and appropriateness *vis-à-vis* social representation and a range of functions was established. Vitruvianism made it possible to redefine that medieval notion of what constituted an ambitious building. While medieval builders sought to emulate good buildings in terms of their size and structural boldness, Renaissance architectural theory placed emphasis on the *imitatio auctorum*, producing numerous precise and sometimes rather obstinate studies on *all' antica* dispositions, proportions and details. This led to the development of a new kind of architectural production, which could rely on a canonical, normative and systematic theory of "good forms", and which could express the expectations of patrons and measure the quality of architects in more or less universal terms. The notion that the planning and construction procedure was in fact part of a dense network of venerable acts in the succession of King Solomon and other role models had gone out of fashion. Instead, aesthetical dogmas reigned supreme, their various canons leading to a new evaluation of the formal aspects of architecture. Renaissance categories such as "convenient", "beautiful", "well-proportioned" replaced medieval terms like "bold", "miraculous" or "overwhelming". What was formerly transcendental – and this included *imitatio morum* – made way for a new understanding of history, with its juxtaposition of antiquity and modernity and emphasis on *imitatio auctorum*.

Cell Vaults in the Architecture of Islam and the West

Peter Draper

The spectacular effects and the remarkable originality of the so-called "diamond" or "cell" vaults of Eastern Europe in the late Middle Ages have received renewed attention in recent years. The striking qualities of these vaults were beautifully illustrated in the exhibition of photographs held at the Architectural Association in London in 2005 and their history and development lucidly explored in the excellent accompanying book by Zoë Opačić. In that account she makes brief reference, as others have done before, to parallels that can be drawn with similar vaults to be found in Islamic architecture.[1] While the similarities have been noted, the implications of this possible connection have not been explored as fully as might have been expected. The usually cited Islamic examples, which can be dated to no later than the early fifteenth century, predate the earliest cell vaults in Europe that are widely accepted to be in the Albrechtsburg castle at Meissen, begun in 1471, by Arnold von Westfalen.[2] In view of this chronological priority, the suggestion that western cell vaults might be dependent on Islamic exempla is understandable.[3]

The juxtaposition of a vault in the Masjid-i Jami in Yazd and one in the cloister of the Franciscan monastery in Gdańsk (Figs 1 and 2) reveals a arresting *visual* similarity, but is that in itself sufficient to postulate the likelihood of a connection? Might there be alternative ways of explaining the similarity by exploring other aspects of these vaults, such as the materials of construction, the scale and positioning of these vaults within buildings and the motivation for seeking this particular aesthetic effect? Furthermore, any suggested connection between the two traditions would require a plausible motivation for emulation and possible means of transmission. The purpose of this short paper is to consider some of the methodological issues raised by this proposed connection and to suggest ways of approaching this question by setting these vaults within the wider context of the building traditions in the two cultures.

Almost exclusively in both traditions, the material employed to construct cell vaults was brick, and since their complex geometry requires considerable skill in the handling of that medium, it is not surprising that the occurrence of these vaults was markedly regional, concentrated in areas where brick was either the dominant building material or where it was widely employed. Prismatic, cell-like forms can be found constructed in stone, particularly in Turkey, but in that medium they are confined to the

[1] Milada and Oldřich Rada, *Das Buch von den Zellengewölben*, Prague, 2001, p. 135-139; Zoë opačić, *Diamond Vaults: Innovation and Geometry in Medieval Architecture*, London, 2005, p. 10.Various terms are employed to describe these vaults. Among them in German (and their equivalents in Polish and Czech) are "diamond" ("Diamantgewölbe") and "cell" ("Zellengewölbe") for which see Paul Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, revised by Paul Crossley, Yale, 2000, p. 359 n. 173B, p. 368 n. 51; in Islamic architecture they have been called "pleated" or "accordion-pleated", "radial gores" in connection with stellate patterns, in Lisa Golombek & Donald Wilber, *The Timurid Architecture of Iran and Turan*, Princeton, 1988, p. 109, and "rhomboidal faceting" in Lisa Golombek, *The Timurid Shrine of Gazur Gah* (Royal Ontario Museum, Occasional Papers 15), 1969, p. 62. Each term brings out a particular aspect of these vaults, but for consistency the term cell vaults will be used in this paper.

[2] Opačić , *Diamond Vaults*, p. 4 ; Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, p. 359, n. 173B. The small number of ribless vaults that occur in Spain, especially in the mid-fifteenth century, have been seen both as derived from Islamic example and as a local development, but not as connected with examples in eastern Europe. See Rada, "*Zellengewölben*", p. 16-18 and James. H. Acland, *The Gothic Vault*, Toronto, 1972, p. 221, n. 2.

[3] For example, Rada, "*Zellengewölben*", p. 137- 139; Frank Woodman, "Cell vaults" entry in *The Dictionary of Art*, ed. Jane Turner, vol. 32, p. 88: "Late medieval cellular vaults probably imitate Islamic design, where cellular vaults were commonly employed within pendentives or squinches of domes, as in the Muradiye Camii (1424-6) in Bursa".

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100150

Fig. 1 Yazd, Masjid-i Jami, vault of prayer chamber adjacent to main dome (Photo Peter Draper)

Fig. 2 Gdańsk, Franciscan Monastery, cloister vault c.1496 (Photo Peter Draper)

zone of transition beneath a dome, as in the Yeşil Camii in Bursa of 1419.[4] It is unlikely that there is any connection between the appearance of these 'Turkish pleats' in the zone of transition and the development of cell vaults in Iran and Khurasan.[5] The limited access to building stone in Iran and surrounding regions meant that there had been a long tradition of building in brick and, from the Seljuq period onwards, of creating patterns in vaults through the ingenious laying of bricks. Good examples are to be found in the Great Mosque at Esfahan, in the late eleventh-century north and south domes, and in the oft-renewed smaller domes over the passageways (Fig. 3). It is not difficult to see how these two-dimensional stellate patterns could develop into three-dimensional, cell-like structures by changing the angle of the laying of the bricks.

In Europe, cell vaults – with or without ribs – normally constitute the vault itself, whereas in the Islamic tradition they are almost invariably a decorative overlay of brick and plaster, supported free of the wall and suspended below the constructional vault, held up by quick-setting plaster and wooden armatures.[6] This use of a decorative surface suspended beneath the structural vault also had a long history in the development of the muqarnas vault, offering an interesting parallel to the emergence of cell vaults. Indeed, in examples where the muqarnas are rigidly schematised and geometric, they can be seen to be closely related to cell vaults, as in the vault over the shrine of Shaykh 'Abd al-Samad at Natanz of 1307 (Fig. 4). Muqarnas vaults, however, retain the effect of overall decorative texture, denying the apparent structural sense

[4] Henri Stierlin, *Turkey: from the Selçuks to the Ottomans*, Cologne, 1998, p. 92-93. The "Turkish pleats" or Turkish triangles (trihedral designs) can be found from the late fourteenth century as in the Yildirim mosque in Bursa, built by Bayazid I between 1390 and 1395 "entirely of hewn stone" according to Oktay Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture*, London, 1971, p. 197. Muqarnas, too, were mostly constructed in plaster, but they are found as corbelled features in stone, as in the portals of a number of caravanserais in the region of Aksaray and Konya. For accessible illustrations, see Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture,* p.147-161.

[5] A possible connection between the Bursa mosques and Herat is mentioned in Bernard O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture in Khurasan*, Costa Mesa CA, 1987, p. 171 where he also refers to Golombek's suggestion that the twin domes of the Masjid-i Jami in Herat might be dependent on the Orhan Bey mosque in Bursa. For connections between Yazd and Khurasan see O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture,* p. 324.

[6] See O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture,* p. 46-51 and pl. 22.5 for a photograph of a partially fallen vault.

Fig. 3 Esfahan, Great Mosque, passageway vault (Photo Peter Draper)

Fig. 4 Natanz, shrine of shrine of ʿAbd al-Samad, 1307 (Photo Peter Draper)

Fig. 5 Yazd, Mosque of Mir Chaqmaq, 'winter' prayer hall, dated by inscription, 1436 (Photo Peter Draper)

that remains with the cell vault.[7] The method of construction also had the effect of limiting the scale of cell vaults, which tended to be used over relatively narrow spans, often of subsidiary spaces, rather than for main vaults, which, in the Islamic tradition, were usually domes or pointed barrel vaults.

Cell vaults in Islamic architecture were almost invariably centralised and symmetrical, and did not exploit the inherent flexibility of design to cover irregular and eccentric spaces, as happened on occasion in Europe.[8] For larger spans, configurations of pleats or cells in the form of faceted rhomboids were used in association with other structural features and constituted only part of the vaults. In the winter prayer hall in the complex of Mir Chaqmaq in Yazd, for example, the pleated stellate patterns are confined to the spaces between massive transverse arches (Fig. 5). Elsewhere, the faceted rhomboids appear in conjunction with squinch-net vaults, which were formed from intersecting arches thrown across the space parallel to the walls. This device had a long history, having been employed from the tenth century at Cordoba in the vault over the bay in front of the mihrab, where the intersecting arches support a foiled octagonal fluted dome, but it was developed into more sophisticated forms by Timurid architects, especially during the fifteenth century.[9] O'Kane has observed that "a frequently added embellishment to the rhomboidal compartments of the squinch-net vaults was provided by faceting. Breaking them up into compartments at different angles to one another", citing as examples vaults in the Masjid-i Jami and the Madrasa of Firuzshah at Turbat-i Jām, and in the nearby mausoleum of Qasim-i Anvar at Langar (Fig. 6).[10] These squinch-net vaults also provide examples of faceted cells being employed with and without ribs; an interesting parallel with the vaults at Meissen.[11] The exploration of these varied forms was facilitated by the extensive building activity in Khurasan during the reign of Shah Rukh and probably owes much to the architect Qavām al-Din Shirazi (*floruit* 1410-38).[12] In terms of experimentation with brick patterning, and in being constructed as an inner plane of decoration attached to the structural walls and vaults, the emergence of these cell-like vaults, mainly in Iran and Khurasan, can thus be seen as firmly rooted in Islamic building traditions.

[7] This is vividly demonstrated in the dome of the Gundab-i Khisti in Mashad where the muqarnas effectively fragment bold, radial furrows over pointed windows, O'Kane , *Timurid Architecture*, pl. 10.3.

[8] Opačić , *Diamond Vaults*, p. 8; Golombek , *The Timurid Shrine of Gahur Gah*, p. 63. There were exceptions, such as Ziyaratgah, Golombek & Wilber, *The Timurid Architecture of Iran and Turan*, p.111 & pl. 313.

[9] "Squinch-net vaulting is the most important innovation in Timurid architecture and seems to develop from earlier experiments with transverse vaulting over rectangular spaces…the interstices between the ribs and squinches are filled with facetted and painted plaster. The advantages of this system are manifold: the vault is significantly smaller than the room it covers; it is relatively light in weight; the loads are concentrated on points rather than walls, as in Gothic architecture, allowing the walls to be opened up with windows…", Sheila S. Blair & Jonathan M. Bloom, *The Art and Architecture of Islam 1250-1800*, Yale, 1994, p. 46.

[10] O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture*, p. 51 and pls. 24.3 and 39.4. See also p. 221 for Turbat-i Jām, "…interest is generated by faceting the compartments of the squinch-net vaults at different angles, creating a play of light and shade which is echoed and intensified in the zig-zag pattern which surrounds the base of the dome". The mausoleum is datable to circa 1487 and is cited by Golombek as the most complex of the series of these star vaults. Golombek, *Gazur Gah*, p. 64; O'Kane , *Timurid Architecture*, cat. 39, p. 283-285.

[11] "Ribs" in Islamic tradition normally constituted arbitrary additions to vaults for aesthetic not structural reasons, O'Kane *Timurid Architecture*, p. 51.

[12] O'Kane, "Tāybād, Turbat-i Jām and Timurid Vaulting", in *Iran* 17, 1976, 87-104.

Can the same line of argument – that the essential elements of cell vaults are embedded in the preceding architecture – be employed to explain the appearance of cell vaults in eastern Europe in the later fifteenth century? Or might their apparently sudden appearance have been dependent on the impetus provided by knowledge of, and influence from, the Islamic tradition? Complex groin vaults with concave, curved webs between the groins, especially over irregular bays, are found in Romanesque and Early Gothic. At the Cistercian abbey church of Heisterbach (1202-37), for example, hollow vault webs between groins can be found rising from the arches of the upper passage in the apse.[13] These are superficially reminiscent of Hadrianic "pumpkin" domes (for example, the dome of the entrance vestibule of the Piazza d'Oro, Hadrian's villa at Tivoli), but the similarity is unlikely to be the result of direct influence and is much more likely to be accounted for as a comparable solution to the same problem; namely, that of constructing a (half-)domical vault above arcuated openings, which leads naturally to the use of a concave profile to the webs between the groins.

Fig. 6 Langar, Mausoleum of Qasim-i Anvar (from Bernard O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture in Khurasan,* Costa Mesa CA, 1987, reproduced by kind permission)

A sharp crease at the junction of two webs had continued to be a feature of Gothic rib vaults and in the presbytery vault at Wells of the 1340s a sharp groin bisects a rhomboid, albeit as a projecting rather than recessive feature, exemplifying the interplay of ribs and vault web characteristic of Late Gothic vaults. More complex curved and skewed webs resulted from the greater elaboration of rib vaults, especially in order to accommodate large window openings that were such a feature of fourteenth-century architecture throughout Europe. It can be argued, therefore, that the constituent elements of the cell vault can be found in the western vaulting tradition, though less obviously, and given the variety of experiments in vaulting in the late medieval period, it is not difficult to envisage the taking of the next step: the accentuation of the pattern of the ribs by making the rhomboidal webs concave, sharpening the pattern by making them angular. More imaginative, in the context of the contemporary development of highly complex patterns in rib vaults, was the decision to omit ribs and to allow the faceted concave elements, separated only by groins, to be the dominant pattern. As Opačić has observed, the precedents for this lie in the increasing autonomy accorded to patterns of ribs and the detachment of that pattern from the shape of the vault behind, leaving irregular webs between the differing springing levels of the ribs.[14] Even so, the omission of that key feature of Gothic vaulting, the rib, does seem more

[13] Rada, "*Zellengewölben*", p. 16.

[14] Opačić , *Diamond Vaults*, p. 11.

of a leap in the western tradition than it had been in Islamic architecture and arouses suspicion that it might have been triggered by some stimulus. If this was through knowledge of Islamic vaults, some obvious questions have to be addressed: how might this knowledge have been acquired, by what means might it have been conveyed, and why might these Islamic cell vaults have been of interest to Europeans at that particular time?

Before addressing these questions, attention needs to be drawn to some further aspects of these vaults. The recent study by Opačić highlighted three interesting aspects to the use of cell vaults: that they were normally employed over relatively small spans not exceeding 9 metres; that they were often employed in secular buildings; and that where they appear in ecclesiastical buildings they are often over subsidiary spaces, such as aisles and cloisters. This leads naturally to a consideration of the motives for employing this type of vault in preference to others. Was the use limited by structural considerations or determined by a sense of decorum? In the exceptionally large church of St Mary's, Gdańsk, for example, the cell vaults appear in the aisle, not over the main span of the nave (Fig. 7), but in smaller churches they can constitute the main vault over the choir, as at Tábor. The plain simplicity of these vaults is striking though painted decoration does occur and more may have been lost.[15] Given the occurrence of fine examples of these vaults in houses of reformed Franciscans, it is tempting to associate the use of such vaults with what might have been deemed an appropriate aesthetic for a reformed order.[16] Yet these simplified vaults, used for the most part for subsidiary spaces in an ecclesiastical context could at the same time be used as high status vaults in secular buildings. This raises further challenging questions about the evidence for a sense of decorum in the use of particular architectural features in what was felt to be a suitable manner in both ecclesiastical and secular contexts.

An argument for the employment of these cell vaults with a sense of decorum could also be put forward for their use in Islamic buildings. In the Masjid-i Jami at Yazd (Fig. 1), for example, the main domed chamber is covered with glazed tiles, whereas the cell vaults occur in smaller, lateral spaces. The spare aesthetic of these otherwise undecorated subsidiary spaces dominates the nearby complex of Mir Chaqmaq in Yazd, notably in its 'winter' prayer hall where the glazed tiling is limited to dado level and the pleated stellate patterns occur between the transverse arches (Fig.5). In this case, the simplified aesthetic may be accounted for by the provincial, rather than metropolitan, context for this complex, but it must have been aesthetically acceptable to the patrons, who were of high status.[17] Painted decoration has survived on a few of these vaults and more has undoubtedly been lost, as in case of western vaults, so at least some of them may have been less plain than they are now.[18] It is notable, however, that spaces of greater importance, such as those containing a shrine, tend to be vaulted with squinch-net vaults adorned with more elaborate decoration in the faceted rhomboids, as in the lecture hall of the Madrasa al-Ghiyathiyya at Khargird (Fig. 7). The absence of specific contemporary comment on these vaults makes it impossible to say more about aesthetic preference. It is not known whether any particular significance was attached to the omission of ribs, as in both traditions faceted cells appear in association with ribs and separated only by groins.

Western patrons could have had direct knowledge of Islamic vaults, given the extent and importance of trading and cultural links between Europe and the eastern Mediterranean and the lands

[15] Opačić, *Diamond Vaults*, p. 32-34.

[16] Opačić, *Diamond Vaults*, p. 16-17.

[17] The complex, comprising a four-iwan mosque, khanaqah, qanat, cistern and well and supported by a nearby bath and caravanserai, was built (according to a foundation inscription) in 841H /1437 by Shahrukh's governor, Mir Chaqmaq, and his wife, Fatima Katun. According to Blair & Bloom, *Art and Architecture of Islam 1250-1800*, p. 48, it is an example of a regional style that "was related to but distinct from the metropolitan style of northeast Iran. In contrast to the light and airy quality of the finest metropolitan buildings, these provincial examples are heavier and never vaulted with intersecting arches. Walls are usually whitewashed; decoration is confined to tiled dados and minbars". As an aside, it may be noted that in the mihrab of the mosque there are free-standing ribs with no webbing between.

[18] O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture*, p. 62-4.

Fig. 7 Gdańsk, St Mary, nave and aisle vaults (Photo Peter Draper)

beyond along the Silk Route; links that have been extensively explored in recent years. However, the likelihood of a direct connection in this instance is rendered less likely, in part by the geographical remoteness of the areas where the major examples of these cell vaults are to be found, Iran and Khurasan, but, more forcefully, by the nature of the architectural motif itself.[19] Ostentatious features, such as glazed tiles and complex arch forms for windows, are features that would most readily catch the eye of a traveller interested in foreign architecture and looking to emulate the exotic, but it seems highly improbable that plain, pleated vaults over subsidiary spaces would have caught their attention in the same way. Moreover, these vaults are less amenable to transmission by drawing than in the case of the geometric patterns of tilework and the profile of window arches. Interestingly, surviving architectural drawings in both traditions concentrate on the complexity of vaults and although comparable superimposed two-dimensional conventions were employed to represent three-dimensional features in both western and Islamic traditions, in each the legibility of the convention presupposed knowledge of the appearance of the vaults and familiarity with the methods of construction.[20] A remarkable collection of drawings of muqarnas and squinch-net vault designs from Iran has been preserved in the Topkapi Scroll, but none of them relate specifically to cell vaults. In her analysis of these drawings, Necipoglu concludes that they were addressed to a narrow circle of initiated craftsmen already acquainted with inherited craft traditions, and that the coded working drawings record workshop practices by means of economically rendered repeat units and do not seem to have been intended as presentation draw-

[19] Tabriz and other cities in Persia were certainly familiar to Venetian merchants from the early fourteenth century and for a helpful discussion of the varied means of transmission see Deborah Howard, *Venice and the East: the impact of the Islamic world on Venetian architecture 1100-1500*, New Haven 2000, p. 43-53. The strongest contacts, however, were between Venice and Turkey, but in Turkey the faceted or pleated features are confined to the zone of transition beneath a dome, and are not convincing as a seminal source for the development of European cell vaults.

[20] More work is needed on the constructional techniques employed in the two traditions.

ings.[21] Thus, in all likelihood, any drawing of a muqarnas or related vault that reached Europe would have made as little sense to European craftsmen as the drawings of late Gothic vaults in the Vienna and Dresden sketchbooks to their Islamic counterparts.

Conceivably, less precise means of conveying the effect of cell vaults might have been used, in the form of rough sketches or verbal descriptions, but an explanation would still be required as to why this type of vault should have been developed in Saxony rather than Venice or other cities with strong trading links with the East. In the absence of further direct evidence, it seems more probable that the development of cell vaults in Europe was an imaginative step within the western tradition and was not dependent on Islamic example. In this case, the visual similarities are misleading; apparently similar forms in different regions can be developed independently and the assumption should not be made too readily that they must somehow be connected.

Fig. 8 Khargird, Madrasa al-Ghiyathiyya, lecture hall (from Bernard O'Kane, *Timurid Architecture in Khurasan,* Costa Mesa CA, 1987, reproduced by kind permission)

[21] Gülru Necipoglu, *The Topkapi Scroll: geometry and ornament in Islamic architecture*, Santa Monica, 1995, p. 38; Howard, *Venice and the East*, p. 54. The similarity in the conventions employed in drawings of vaults in the western and Islamic traditions argued by Necipoglu has been challenged by Arash Etemad Yousefi, "Medieval Islamic and Gothic Drawings: Masons, Craftsmen and Architects", unpublished M.Sc, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2005, p. 9-29. In the Islamic tradition there are no drawings of elevations to compare with those in the west for facades, as, for example, at Strasbourg, Siena and Cologne.

Ars sine historia nihil est? How the "Story Deficit" Doomed Gothic Architecture

Robert Bork

Paul Crossley's short but provocative 1993 article "The Return to the Forest: Natural Architecture and the German Past in the Age of Dürer" argued that a growing awareness of Italian Renaissance theory helped to catalyze two noteworthy developments in German Late Gothic architecture: the creation of monuments explicitly representing vegetal branchwork, like the famous vaults of Ingolstadt's Frauenkirche (Fig. 1); and the publication of design booklets like Matthäus Roriczer's *Büchlein von der Fialen Gerechtigkeit*.[1] In both cases, Crossley suggested, northern builders sought to justify their native traditions by responding to the challenge of classical architectural theory in forms that their erudite patrons could appreciate. By rendering ribs as branches, German builders may have deliberately invoked Vitruvius's idea that architecture began with the construction of wooden huts, and Tacitus's reports that Germans of his day worshipped their gods in forest groves. In arguing for this interpretation, Crossley situated the literal flourishing of the branchwork style around 1500 within the larger framework of the German humanist intellectual project.[2] As he observed, northern humanists would have been particularly attuned to architectural theory after 1485, a year that saw the publication of printed editions of Vitruvius's *De architectura* and its Renaissance successor, Alberti's *De re aedificatoria*. Crossley therefore had good reason to suggest that Wilhelm von Reichenau, the erudite Bishop of Eichstätt to whom Roriczer dedicated his *Büchlein*, may have been the real driving force behind the booklet's publication in 1486. The bishop and other northern patrons of his class may well have hoped that they could encourage Gothic builders to produce new buildings and writings that could stand proudly alongside the products of the Italian Renaissance. Despite the brilliant achievements of Late Gothic builders, though, Gothic traditions were swept aside with surprising speed in the decades after 1500.

The failure of Gothic architectural culture to survive the encounter with its Renaissance counterpart raises important questions about the criteria patrons used to judge buildings, and builders. In what respects did patrons find Renaissance buildings superior to Gothic ones? To what extent were their judgments of architectural quality informed by their views on architectural theory? And, why did the architectural and textual responses outlined by Crossley fail so utterly to meet the Italian challenge? The present essay will argue that northern patrons embraced classical design in the sixteenth century not because classical buildings had inherent architectural advantages in structural, economic, and aesthetic terms, but rather because they were more intimately associated with texts, theories, and

[1] Paul Crossley, "The Return to the Forest: Natural Architecture and the German Past in the Age of Dürer", in *Künstlerischer Austausch: Artistic Exchange; Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte*, ed. Thomas W. Ghaetgens, Berlin, 1993, vol. 2, p. 71-80.

[2] Crossley's interpretation thus differed from that of Karl Oettinger, who pioneered the idea of branchwork structures as heavenly gardens in "Laube, Garten und Wald: Zu einer Theorie der süddeutschen Sakralkunst 1470-1520", in *Festschrift für Hans Sedlmayr*, Munich, 1962, p. 201-228. For more recent perspectives on the branchwork style, see Hubertus Günther, "Das Astwerk und die Theorie der Renaissance von der Entstehung der Architektur", in *Théorie des arts et création artistique dans l'Europe du Nord du XVIe au début du XVIIIe siècle*, ed. Michèle-Caroline Heck, Frédérique Lemerle & Yves Pauwels, Lille, 2002, p. 14-27; Hanns Hubach, "Johann von Dalberg und das naturalistische Astwerk in der zeitgenössischen Skulptur in Worms, Heidelberg und Ladenburg", in *Der Wormser Bischof Johann von Dalberg (1482 - 1503) und seine Zeit*, ed. Gerold Bönnen & Burkard Keilmann, Mainz, 2005, p. 207-232; and Ethan Matt Kavaler, "Nature and the Chapel Vaults at Ingolstadt: Structuralist and Other Perspectives", in *The Art Bulletin*, 87, 2005, p. 230-248.

10.1484/M.SGA-EB.1.100151

Fig. 1 Ingolstadt, Frauenkirche, chapel vaults by Erhard and Ulrich Heydenreich, 1510-1512, (Photo Robert Bork)

stories that humanist patrons found appealing. Since these men seem to have worked on the principle that *ars sine historia nihil est* – to modify Jean Mignot's famous comment about Milan Cathedral – Gothic architecture came in their eyes to suffer from a serious "story deficit".[3]

Gothic builders evidently attempted to respond to this crisis by creating an architecture rich in textual and theoretical resonances, as Crossley suggests in discussing Roriczer's writings and the branchwork style. But these attempts to justify Gothic architecture through published treatises and explicitly representational articulation were inherently problematic, since these responses accept the logocentric and associative logic of classicism. Gothic architecture was effectively doomed as soon as its champions began to play a theoretical game where the rules had been defined by their Italian rivals. In the language of the modern-day marketplace, this essay will therefore suggest that Gothic architecture fell out of fashion not because of inherent flaws in the product, but rather because the competitor had better advertising.

Gothic builders proved to be less effective salesmen than their Italian rivals for several interrelated reasons. First, they were working in a geometrically-based design mode that was intrinsically harder to explain in words than the classical mode.[4] Second, they lacked the rhetorical sophistication of Italian writers such as Alberti, whose knowledge of Ciceronian Latin helped elevate his ideas beyond the sphere of "mere" craft. Third, they could not "bundle" their architectural product as effectively with the most advanced products of military engineering, a field where Italian innovations provided genuine functional advantages in the late fifteenth century.[5] Finally, and most importantly, they could not easily associate Gothic architecture with the impressive political, artistic, and intellectual achievements of the ancient world, which were attracting well-deserved attention in the period. From this perspective, the displacement of Gothic architecture by Italianate classicism after 1500 seems all but inevitable.

In the fifteenth century, though, the outcome of this stylistic confrontation would have been hard to predict. In purely architectural terms, the Gothic tradition had many advantages over its upstart Renaissance rival. Late Gothic designers were genuine architectural experts, using design and construction methods that had been progressively refined in the three centuries since the days of Abbot Suger. They had developed effective design solutions for churches, city halls, market halls, and residences, in a wide range of subtypes and styles to suit patrons with different budgets and programmatic requirements. Prudent patrons had good reason to value this practical expertise, and to view with skepticism calls to follow the precepts of an ancient legacy that remained poorly understood, and whose applicability in the fifteenth-century world remained unclear. Roman amphitheaters, bath complexes, and pagan temples were undeniably impressive, but they could not easily be replicated, and their functions ranged from irrelevant to downright suspect, in any case. Even in the realm of symbolic association, therefore, Gothic architecture had an important advantage over Italianate classicism, since it had stronger credentials as a purely Christian style.[6]

[3] James Ackerman, "Ars sine scientia nihil est: Gothic Theory of Architecture at the Cathedral of Milan", in *The Art Bulletin*, 31, 1949, p. 84-111.

[4] This communication problem will be addressed with explicit geometrical examples in Robert Bork, "The Unspeakable Logic of Gothic Architecture", in *Le Gothique de la Renaissance*, ed. Monique Chatenet, Paris, 2011, p. 115-123.

[5] The massive bastions first popularized in Italy were necessary to defend effectively against powerful cannon, but the construction of these expensive fortifications also had a strong propagandistic function. See Stephan Hoppe, "Artilleriewall und Bastion: Deutscher Festungsbau der Renaissancezeit im Spannungsfeld zwischen apparativer und medialer Funktion", in *Jahrbuch des Jülicher Geschichtsvereins*, 74-75, 2006-2007, p. 35-63.

[6] This was the case, at least, until the papal court began its own programmatic embrace of the classical vocabulary, evident most spectacularly in the reconstruction of Saint Peter's Basilica. The implications of this programme for the symbolism of the classical orders are well discussed in John Onians, *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance*, Princeton, 1990, esp. p. 192-207.

Fig. 2 Jean Fouquet, Etienne Chevalier Presented by Saint Stephen to the Virgin and Child, Hours of Etienne Chevalier, Chantilly, Musée Condé, Ms 71, fols 4v (A), and 5r (B), 1452-1460. (Photo René-Gabriel Ojéda, Réunion des Musées Nationaux / Art Resource, NY)

The French artist Jean Fouquet, working in the middle of the fifteenth century, juxtaposed the Gothic and Italianate design modes in telling fashion in two facing pages from the Book of Hours made for Etienne Chevalier (Fig. 2, Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS 71, fols. 4v and 5r). The left page shows Chevalier, the work's earthly patron, kneeling in front of a wall articulated with classical pilasters of Brunelleschian appearance. The right page, meanwhile, shows the Virgin Mary suckling the Christ Child in a French-style Gothic church portal. In Fouquet's bifolio, admittedly, the contrast between sacred and mundane is less than absolutely strict. Saint Stephen stands on the left page, presenting Chevalier to the Virgin, and figures of angels and putti spill across both pages. On balance, though, it seems clear that Fouquet associated the Renaissance mode more closely with the human, and the Gothic mode more closely with the divine realm. At almost any point in the previous millennium of European history, this would have implied the unambiguous superiority of the Gothic over the classical. By the fifteenth century, however, the relative primacy of the religious sphere had been destabilized by factors including the crises of the papacy in the Great Schism, the rising power of secular governments, especially princely courts, and the flourishing of humanist scholarship.

The rise of a humanistically educated princely class appears to have played a particularly strong role in forcing the revaluation of the Gothic and classical architectural modes, as Crossley suggested. Many educated courtly patrons evidently wanted to support art projects whose intellectual foundations they understood and appreciated. Classical architecture appealed to such patrons in ways that Gothic architecture could not. In many respects, the Renaissance architectural quest to rediscover the logic of antique buildings paralleled the Renaissance philological quest to reconstruct the authoritative original forms of classical texts. More broadly, one could argue that this process of discovery paralleled

the currents of analytical thought that fostered the growing intellectual engagement with the natural world in the Renaissance. However, while contemporary advances in fields such as astronomy, navigation, and realistic painting all involved an open-minded search for truth, the embrace of "correct" classical design involved a mind-closing insistence upon an essentially arbitrary architectural dogma.[7] It is hardly surprising, though, that patrons of the day saw particular advantages in the classical mode.

Classical art flatters its patrons by associatively placing them in positions of political, existential, and intellectual authority. The decor in Renaissance palaces often invited their patrons to think of themselves as Greek heroes, or Roman emperors. Such allusions were commonplace already in the Middle Ages, of course, but the embrace of the classical vocabulary endowed them with new levels of force and plausibility. In the strictly architectural sphere, classical design reinforced the dignity of rulership not only by referencing the Roman world, but also by incorporating the anthropocentric idea that a column's proportions should be based on those of the human body. The soaring proportions typical of Gothic architecture, by contrast, suggest the transcendence of human limitations. And, the daunting complexity of Gothic buildings, which often incorporated the formal principles that Paul Frankl called partiality and subdivision, tended implicitly to treat the viewer as a small part of a divine and mysterious cosmos.[8] In aesthetic as well as iconographical terms, therefore, classical architecture could appeal to the vanity of its patrons in ways that Gothic architecture could not.

All of this would have been beside the point, of course, if patrons throughout Europe had remained ignorant of classical architecture and its theoretical foundations. In this context, it becomes important to distinguish between superficial awareness and real intellectual engagement. Italian achievements in the arts were certainly known throughout medieval Europe, at least in a superficial sense. Given the prominent place of Italy in European commercial, political, and religious life, this is entirely natural. Many travelers from all walks of life would have seen Italian buildings, and carried descriptions of them back to their home countries. But only a few northern artists, like Fouquet, engaged closely with the classical legacy before 1500. It is worth emphasizing, in fact, that Italianate architecture did not simply spread organically into the rest of Europe. Instead, it was generally imposed from above, by kings, princes, and their humanist associates. The case of Hungary provides an exceptionally early example of this process, since King Matthias Corvinus (1458-1490) embraced Italianate design starting already in the 1460s. Several specific factors help to explain the anomalous Hungarian situation: the fact that Corvinus was tutored as a young man by the humanist Jánoz Vitéz; the fact that the king chose Italian military engineers to build fortifications against the Turks; and the fact that many Italian artists joined his court after his marriage to Princess Beatrice of Naples in 1474.[9] In the rest of Europe, Gothic remained the overwhelmingly dominant architectural style for another half-century, but growing familiarity with Italian Renaissance theory in educated courtly circles had begun by the closing decades of the fifteenth century to challenge the hegemony of the Gothic mode.

The publication of treatises such as Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* doubtless played a crucial role in spreading the taste for classical architecture beyond Italy. As the stereotypical "Renaissance man" of many talents, Alberti had an impressively broad knowledge of the arts, one that he was able to com-

[7] As Marvin TRACHTENBERG has emphasized, classical forms remained in use throughout the Middle Ages, especially in Italy. The history of Italian Renaissance architecture involved the suppression of "error" rather than the "rebirth" of motifs that had been lost. See his "Gothic/Italian 'Gothic': Toward a Redefinition", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 50, 1991, p. 22-37, esp. p. 34-37.

[8] Paul FRANKL, *Gothic Architecture*, Baltimore, 1962, p. 10-14, 265-270.

[9] *The Architecture of Historic Hungary*, ed. Dora WIEBENSON & József SISA, Cambridge, Mass., 1998, p. 45-66. See also Jan BIAŁOSTOCKI, *The Art of the Renaissance in Eastern Europe: Hungary, Bohemia, Poland*, Oxford, 1976, esp. p. 7-9.

[10] Leon Battista ALBERTI, *De re aedificatoria. On the Art of Building in Ten Books*, trans. Joseph RYKWERT, Neil LEACH & Robert TAVERNOR, Cambridge, MA, 1988. On Alberti's career more generally, see Anthony GRAFTON, *Leon Battista Alberti: Master Builder of the Italian Renaissance*, New York, 2000.

municate with intellectual rigour and rhetorical flair.[10] Building on the pioneering work of Brunelleschi, Alberti described a mathematically coherent approach to linear perspective in his treatise on painting, *De pictura*. He also wrote on sculpture, the other most noted representational art of Antiquity, in *De statua*. In writing *De re aedificatoria* as comprehensive ten-volume book on architecture, Alberti self-consciously modeled himself after Vitruvius, but his work was far more hortatory than his ancient predecessor's had been. Instead of simply chronicling the way architecture had been practiced, Alberti outlined a programme for how it should be practiced, building on the lessons of Antiquity, but adapting them for a new era. Alberti thus managed to articulate a programme that was at once historically informed and progressive, a mixture that educated patrons of the day found seductive. It seems clear that patrons rather than builders were the intended audience for *De re aedificatoria*, since it was written in eloquent Ciceronian Latin and published initially with only a few illustrations.

Gothic builders responded to the challenge of the Renaissance architecture in several distinct ways, none of which succeeded in stemming the tide of influence from Italy. One response, as Crossley suggested, was to try to explain their working methods to their patrons, as Roriczer appears to have done with his *Büchlein*. The Gothic design process, however, was inherently convoluted, and difficult to explain in words. Unlike the rules of classical architecture, which governed the form of the finished building, the rules of Gothic architecture governed the logic of the design process itself.[11] And, while the fixed conventions of classical architecture involved simple modules and the proportions of the human body, the conventions of Gothic architecture involved complex geometrical operations unfolding in open-ended sequences.[12] The Gothic design method was not inherently unlearnable, of course, as the continuity of Gothic architectural culture over more than three centuries amply demonstrates. But this continuity depended to a large extent on the particular circumstances of the medieval workshop tradition, in which apprentices could learn design strategies from their masters in a hands-on process of learning by doing. Such interactive visual instruction methods translated only awkwardly into textual form, as Roriczer and his colleagues discovered.

Gothic builders would have had a hard time explaining their design process to non-specialists, even if they had shared Alberti's command of Ciceronian Latin. In practice, though, their writings emerged from a far less sophisticated rhetorical tradition. As Ulrich Coenen has emphasized, Gothic design handbooks like Roriczer's belonged to a textual class that included cookbooks and other recipe-based "how-to" manuals. The survival of the so-called Vienna *Werkmeisterbuch* shows that architectural ideas were already being recorded in this genre in the early fifteenth century, before the challenge of Italian Renaissance architectural theory had really emerged.[13] Crossley was probably correct, though, to see the publication of Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* as an important catalyst for the creation of Roriczer's *Büchlein*. Roriczer's booklet, unlike the earlier Viennese example, was explicitly addressed to an

[11] In terms of complexity theory, one might therefore say that Gothic design involves process descriptions, while classical architecture involves state descriptions. See Herbert SIMON, "The Architecture of Complexity", in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*, 106, 1962, p. 467-482.

[12] A classic exposition of the Renaissance design mode and its meanings is Rudolf WITTKOWER, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*, London, 1949. The geometrical logic of the Gothic design mode can be traced with particular clarity in drawings. For two case studies of this analytical method, see Robert BORK, "Plan B and the Geometry of Façade Planning at Strasbourg Cathedral 1250-1350", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 64, 2005, p. 442-473, and Robert BORK, "Stacking and 'Octature' in the Geometry of Cologne Plan F", in *The Year 1300 and the Creation of a New European Architecture*, ed. Alexandra GAJEWSKI & Zoë OPAČIĆ (Architectura Medii Aevi, I), Turnhout, 2008, p. 93-110. While the stereotypical Gothic and Renaissance design modes were very different, it is worth noting that medieval design strategies continued to inform even some of the most canonical of early Renaissance monuments. See, for example, Matthew COHEN, "How Much Brunelleschi? A Late Medieval Proportional System in the Basilica of San Lorenzo in Florence", in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 67, 2008, p. 18-57.

[13] Ulrich COENEN, *Die spätgotischen Werkmeisterbücher in Deutschland*, Munich, 1990, esp. p. 10-14. See also Lon R. SHELBY, *Gothic Design Techniques: the Fifteenth-Century Design Booklets of Mathes Roriczer and Hanns Schmuttermayer*, Carbondale, 1977.

Fig. 3 Successive stages in pinnacle design, from Matthäus Roriczer, *Das Büchlein von der Fialen Gerechtigkeit*, 1486, arranged by the author (after Matthäus Roriczer, *Das Büchlein von der Fialen Gerechtigkeit, Faksimile der Originalausgabe, Regensburg 1486, und Matthäus Roriczer, Die Geometria Deutsch, Faksimile der Originalausgabe, Regensuburg um 1487/88, mit einem Nachwort und Textübertragung herausgegeben von Ferdinand Geldner*, Wiesbaden, 1965)

erudite humanist patron, and it seeks to buttress the respectability of Gothic design methods by tying them to the authority of the "Junkers of Prague", the master builders of the Parler family who had dominated central European architectural practice more than a century earlier. Except for this framing discussion, though, Roriczer's booklet remains firmly in the cookbook tradition, outlining in tedious step-by-step detail the successive steps in defining the ground plan and elevation of a pinnacle (Fig. 3). The rationale for the process remains obscure, however, and it is not obvious how this particular pinnacle design recipe relates to the principles of Gothic design more generally. As a rejoinder to Alberti's treatise, therefore, the *Büchlein* was absolutely pitiful, lacking the scope and sophistication of the Italian work. The roughly contemporary pinnacle design booklet published by Hans Schmuttermayr was somewhat more succinct, and the slightly later *Unterweisungen* written by the Heidelberg court architect Lorenz Lechler for his son Moritz were more comprehensive, but none of these late Gothic design booklets generated enough enthusiasm to compete seriously with the influx of architectural publications from Italy.

In the strictly architectural sphere, Gothic builders had much more to offer than they did in the textual sphere. As noted previously, the Gothic tradition had many inherent advantages as a tried

and true architectural system well adapted to the needs of European culture. In the decades bracketing 1500, moreover, Gothic masters constructed a host of dazzling new buildings all across Europe. The sheer variety of national and regional styles that flourished in this period demonstrates that Gothic builders had by no means run out of interesting new ideas by the late fifteenth century. The lush Manueline style of Portugal might at first appear unrelated to the brittle Perpendicular style of England, the sinuous Flamboyant style of France, or the stark brick-based styles of the Baltic. But, all of these modes shared a common ancestry in the Gothic tradition, even as they incorporated external influences, such as those of Islam on the Iberian Peninsula. As Paul Frankl emphasized, the formal trends toward diagonality, partiality, subdivision, and elision that already characterized the earliest phases of Gothic design found their fullest expression in late Gothic buildings.[14] And, even at the most elite levels of architectural culture, where innovation and virtuosity were highly valued, most Gothic builders around 1500 continued to use geometrical design strategies and constructional practices that had evolved directly from the work of their thirteenth-century ancestors.[15] It would thus be misleading to describe this whole explosion of creative energy as a self-conscious reaction to the emergent challenge of Italian Renaissance classicism. When well-educated humanist patrons began to become interested in architectural theory, though, some Gothic designers responded by developing architectural elements with particular intellectual or associative value, as Crossley argued in explaining the origins of the vegetal branchwork style.

Building in part on Crossley's analysis, Matt Kavaler has recently explored the work of Gothic masters who responded to the challenge of Renaissance theory by deploying what he calls "architectural wit".[16] Traditional Gothic architecture, of course, already displays a complex and highly developed formal order that sympathetic beholders can readily sense, even if they cannot fully understand it. Kavaler, though, calls particular attention to the ways in which later Gothic architects commented upon and even deconstructed the geometrical logic of the Gothic design system. Some of these architectural witticisms remained purely abstract and non-representational. By the late fourteenth century, "broken" tracery forms implying the existence of more complete and symmetrical poly-lobed forms had begun to come into vogue. In the closing years of the fifteenth century, the brilliant Bohemian architect Benedikt Ried extended this principle into the third dimension in his design for the vault of the Rider Stair in Prague Castle, a complex structure made of looping but truncated ribs that slice past each other in twirling compass-based patterns whose geometrical logic can only be discerned from vantage points directly beneath each bay center. Other architects, as Kavaler notes, treated the principle of formal disjunction in explicitly representational terms. Thus, for example, one finds pseudo-misaligned ribs held together with fictive bolts at the parish church of Wimpfen am Berg, ribs reinforced by fictive wooden boards at the Benedictine church of Nonnberg in Salzburg (Fig. 4), and ribs lashed onto the piers with fictive rope at the parish church of Kötschach, to cite just three of Kavaler's chosen examples.[17]

Kavaler's treatment of "architectural wit" differs in tone from Crossley's treatment of the branchwork style, but their two analyses together demonstrate that late Gothic designers were in a

[14] Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, p. 212-215.

[15] This methodological continuity will be demonstrated in Robert Bork, *The Geometry of Creation: Architectural Drawing and the Dynamics of Gothic Design*, Farnham, 2011.

[16] Matt Kavaler, "Architectural Wit: Playfulness and Deconstruction in the Gothic of the Sixteenth Century", in *Reading Gothic Architecture*, ed. Matthew Reeve, Turnhout, 2007, p. 139-150.

[17] Kavaler's discussion of these examples builds on previous analyses such as Hans Korner, "Die gestörte Form in der Architektur des späten Mittelalters", in *Festschrift für Hartmut Biermann*, Weinheim, 1990, p. 65-80, and Hubertus Günther, "Die ersten Schritte in die Neuzeit: Gedanken zum Beginn der Renaissance nördlich der Alpen", in *Wege zur Renaissance: Beobachtungen zu den Anfängen neuzeitlicher Kunstauffassung im Rheinland und den Nachbargebieten um 1500*, ed. Norbert Nussbaum, Claudia Euskirchen & Stephan Hoppe, Cologne, 2003, p. 31-85.

Fig. 4 Salzburg, Benedictine abbey Nonnberg, north aisle, detail of vault springer designed by Wolf Wiezinger (Photo Ethan Matt Kavaler)

double bind of sorts when they confronted the challenge of Renaissance architectural theory. Crossley had argued that Gothic designers had to move beyond their purely abstract geometrical design mode if they wished to appeal to their literate humanist patrons. Crossley therefore saw the invention of the branchwork style as a clever breakthrough, one that allowed Gothic designers to provide a new kind of theoretical justification for their work, through allusion to the prestigious ancient writings of Vitruvius and Tacitus. Kavaler, though, points out that the new privileging of representation over geometrical invention was a risky strategy for Gothic architects, one that threatened to erode the conceptual links between Gothic design and the divine world of pure pre-material form. To demonstrate this, Kavaler tellingly contrasts the great sacrament house at Ulm Minster, a work of the 1470s, with the pulpit canopy in the same building designed four decades later (Figs. 5 and 6). Both structures are essentially arrays of slender pinnacles, joined together by interlocking arches into tapering spirelike forms of great complexity. But the pulpit canopy includes a miniature staircase at its center, which Kavaler calls "an oddly representational addendum to a system once able to convey the ascent to celestial heights through metaphorical means". He concludes, therefore, that the devolution of Gothic design into representational witticisms marks the "end of an old order by which Gothic forms signaled a higher level of existence".[18] So, Gothic builders could not easily exploit the representational and allusive strategies outlined by Crossley without sacrificing the qualities that had formerly made their architecture meaningful and rhetorically effective.

A crucial problem for late Gothic builders was that their educated patrons had begun to demand a new kind of legibility from their architecture. Patrons throughout history, of course, had played important roles in defining architectural schemes and iconographical programmes. In the heyday of the Gothic mode, however, designers appear to have enjoyed a great deal of creative autonomy, since their geometrical design methods occupied a visual sphere largely separate from the verbal sphere of the patrons' programmatic demands. The emergence of Renaissance treatises like Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* blurred this distinction by placing architectural theory in the verbal sphere where humanist patrons were more comfortable than their geometrically expert master masons.

Gothic builders confronted with this new situation had to choose among several bad options. They could retreat into geometry and virtuosity, hoping that the humanist demand for legibility would have no practical fallout—a dangerous approach in an era when kings, princes, and highly educated courtiers played an increasingly dominant role in shaping architectural patronage. Alternatively, they could try to explain their methods to their patrons, as Roriczer did, entering a discursive field where Italian authors enjoyed tremendous advantages. In their design practice, they could incorporate witty representational details like those discussed by Kavaler, at risk of trivializing the architectural enterprise. And, finally, they could create forms that alluded to prestigious classical texts, as Crossley suggested in connecting the branchwork style to the writings of Vitruvius and Tacitus. But this approach, of course, was doomed to failure, since classical architecture had far more to gain than Gothic had from the privileging of classical sources and associations.

Gothic architecture retained its prominence into the 1530s and beyond, but the middle decades of the sixteenth century witnessed the rapid displacement of the Gothic mode by classicism in most

[18] Kavaler, "Architectural Wit", p. 148. The novelty of the "representational addenda" Kavaler discusses lies in their almost pedagogical quality, which distinguishes them from the mimetic elements common in earlier microarchitectural shrines. The miniaturized balustrades, windows, and turrets seen in many reliquaries and tabernacles since the early Middle Ages admittedly have an important interpretive function, since they suggest the "real" scale of the objects in question, but they rarely take on the didactic role of the representational elements discussed by Kavaler, which help viewers to sense motion, dynamism, and force in the architectural fabric: staircases suggest ascent, branchwork suggests growth, and tied ropes and bolts suggest the resistance of tension and slippage. There is nothing inherently "wrong" with such literalism, of course, but Kavaler is probably right to see dependence upon it as a sign of failing empathy with the more abstract language of Gothic architectural form.

Fig. 5 Ulm Minster, Sacramental tabernacle likely designed by Moritz Ensinger, circa 1470 (Photo Ethan Matt Kavaler)

Fig. 6 Ulm Minster, Pulpit baldachin designed by Jörg Syrlin the Younger, 1510 (Photo Ethan Matt Kavaler)

Fig. 7 Portal design by Sebastiano Serlio, fig. 148 (from *I Sette Libri dell'Architettura*, book 4, originally 1537, 1584 edition republished by Arnoldo Forni, Bologna, 1987)

major European courts. Since much of the appeal of classicism, for princely patrons, would have been its ability to evoke the glories of ancient civilization, and the might of the Roman Empire in particular, it is ironic that knowledge of classical design spread throughout Europe especially after the successive invasions of Italy undertaken by France, the German Empire, and Spain. It is ironic, too, that the classical style, which had originally come to prominence in humanist circles because of Alberti's literary approach to architectural theory, gained tremendously in popularity after the publication of Serlio's profusely illustrated *Libri*, which made the basics of classical architecture accessible at a glance. Even when developing his playful Mannerist gatehouse designs, Serlio could convey the essential information about the structure in a single simple graphic, in a way that Gothic designers like Roriczer could not (Fig. 7). Renaissance architecture thus flattered the vanity of the educated princely class not only by evoking the achievements of the classical past, but also by defining architectural excellence in ways educated laymen could readily appreciate. And, erudite patrons could clearly see the ways in which Serlio's designs wittily transgressed the norms of classical decorum, even while alluding to them. Gothic architecture, by contrast, made no such inherent appeal to recognizable standards and associations outside its own formal system. In an era where displays of humanist cultural literacy mattered greatly to the princely class, this "story deficit" became a fatal problem. So, while the Renaissance has usually been celebrated for elevating the status of the artist, one of its major side effects was to place new extra-architectural demands on European builders, thereby infringing on their creative autonomy and causing the destabilization of the highly refined Gothic architectural system.